



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

English Language Proficiency Assessment Solution for Multilingual Learners

SOLICITATION # 27BV13P5

PROPOSAL DUE

Thursday, October 8, 2026
3:00 p.m. MDT

QUESTIONS DUE

Thursday, October 1, 2026
3:00 p.m. MDT

Jordan School District
Purchasing Department
Buyer: Brenda Veldevere
7905 South Redwood Road
West Jordan, Utah 84088-4601

CONTENTS

PART 1: OVERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONS	5
1. PURPOSE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)	5
2. DISTRICT BACKGROUND	6
3. ISSUING OFFICE AND RFP SOLICITATION NUMBER.....	6
4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD	6
5. ADDENDA.....	7
6. RESTRICTIONS ON COMMUNICATIONS	7
7. AWARD INTENT.....	8
8. LENGTH OF CONTRACT	8
9. PRICE GUARANTEE PERIOD	8
10. DISCUSSIONS (FOR CLARIFICATION PURPOSES ONLY).....	8
11. STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS, EXCEPTIONS, AND NEGOTIATIONS	8
12. PROTECTED INFORMATION.....	9
A. PROCESS FOR REQUESTING NONDISCLOSURE	10
B. REDACTED COPY	10
13. BOYCOTT RESTRICTIONS	10
14. COMPLIANCE WITH FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT (FERPA).....	11
15. DECLARATION OF DEBARMENT OR SUSPENSION	11
16. BEST AND FINAL OFFER	12
17. COST PROPOSAL	12
18. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING THE RFP	13
Submission Deadline	13
A. ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION THROUGH U3P BONFIRE — REQUIRED	13
B. HARD COPY SUBMISSION — REQUIRED	13
19. OFFEROR’S UNDERSTANDING OF RFP	14
20. FIRM PROPOSAL OFFER PERIOD	14
21. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE	15
PART 2: MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.....	16
1. PURPOSE.....	16
PART 3: SCOPE OF WORK	18
1. PURPOSE	18
2. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT.....	18
3. ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS	19
4. ADMINISTRATION, SCORING, AND REPORTING	19

5. ELLEVATION DATA INTEROPERABILITY	20
6. ROSTERING, ACCESS, AND TECHNICAL INTEROPERABILITY	20
7. ACCESSIBILITY, PRIVACY, SECURITY, AND AUTOMATED TECHNOLOGIES ..	20
8. IMPLEMENTATION AND TRAINING	20
9. TECHNICAL SUPPORT AND SYSTEM RELIABILITY.....	21
10. LICENSING, DATA OWNERSHIP, AND PORTABILITY	21
11. DISTRICT-LEVEL ASSESSMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS.....	21
PART 4: INFORMATION REQUIRED IN SUBMISSION OF A PROPOSAL	23
1. RFP TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT	23
A. TAB TITLE: Vendor Information	23
B. TAB TITLE: Letter of Transmittal (Limit Two (2) Pages)	23
C. TAB TITLE: Table of Contents	24
D. TAB TITLE: Protected or Proprietary Information	24
E. TAB TITLE: Potential Conflicts of Interest	24
F. TAB TITLE: Exceptions and/or Additions to the JSD Standard Terms and Conditions	24
G. TAB TITLE: Mandatory Minimum Requirements (Pass/Fail)	25
H. TAB TITLE: Detailed Technical Proposal Response (Scored Criteria).....	25
A5. Assessment Administration, Scoring, and Results Availability	28
A7. Teacher Assessment Administration and User Experience.....	29
A8. Teacher-Facing Reporting and Instructional Use.....	29
B2. Reporting, Analytics, and Data Use.....	31
B6. District-Level Assessment Administration and Program Management	32
B7. Administrative Roles, Permissions and System Oversight	33
D1. Relevant K–12 and Ellevation Experience	36
2. RFP COST PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT	37
PART 5: RFP EVALUATION AND AWARD	39
1. RFP EVALUATION PROCESS.....	39
A. STAGE 1: DETERMINATION OF RESPONSIVENESS – PASS/FAIL CRITERIA	39
B. STAGE 2: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION – SCORED CRITERIA, 600 POINTS POSSIBLE.....	39
B.1 STAGE 2 SCORING METHODOLOGY.....	40
B.2 STAGE 2 SCORING RUBRIC.....	40
B.3 MINIMUM TECHNICAL SCORE REQUIREMENT.....	41
C. STAGE 3: VIRTUAL PRODUCT DEMONSTRATION – SCORED CRITERIA, 100 POINTS POSSIBLE.....	41
D. STAGE 4: COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION – SCORED CRITERIA, 300 POINTS POSSIBLE.....	42

2. EVALUATED COST.....	43
3. COST SCORING FORMULA	43
4. AWARD	44
5. DEBRIEFINGS AND EVALUATION RESULTS	44

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

English Language Proficiency Assessment Solution for Multilingual Learners

SOLICITATION # 27BV13P5

Jordan School District Purchasing Department has determined that a Request for Proposals (RFP) is the appropriate procurement method to obtain the best value for JSD. This RFP is designed to provide interested Offerors with sufficient information to prepare and submit proposals. It is not intended to limit proposal content or exclude any relevant or essential information. Offerors are encouraged to provide additional relevant information that demonstrates their service capabilities.

This RFP is issued in accordance with the Utah Procurement Code, Utah Code Annotated (UCA) Title 63G, Chapter 6a, and applicable provisions of the Utah Administrative Code (UAC), R33. In the event of a conflict between this RFP and applicable law or administrative rule, the UCA and applicable provisions of the UAC shall govern.

PART 1: OVERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONS

1. PURPOSE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Jordan School District ("JSD" or "District") is seeking proposals from qualified Offerors to provide a web-based English Language Proficiency Assessment Solution for Multilingual Learners (the "Solution").

The purpose of this RFP is to identify a formative and benchmark assessment Solution that provides valid, reliable, timely, and actionable measures of multilingual learners' English language proficiency and language development and that can securely and effectively exchange student-level assessment data with the District's existing Curriculum Associates Ellevation Platform.

JSD currently utilizes Curriculum Associates' Ellevation solutions to support multilingual learner program management, instructional support, and family communication. The District's existing environment includes:

- Ellevation Platform;
- Ellevation Strategies; and
- Ellevation Family Communication.

JSD is **NOT** seeking proposals to replace these existing Ellevation solutions through this RFP.

The Solution procured through this RFP is intended to add an English language proficiency assessment component that supplements, rather than replaces, JSD's existing multilingual learner environment.

JSD is seeking a Solution that supports educators in identifying student strengths and areas of need; monitoring English language development and growth; informing instruction and intervention; supporting benchmarking and progress monitoring; and making student-level assessment information available within the Ellevation Platform for use in the District's multilingual learner program-management processes.

2. DISTRICT BACKGROUND

JSD is the fourth-largest school district in the State of Utah, serving approximately 55,819 students in the communities of Bluffdale, Copperton, Herriman, Riverton, South Jordan, and West Jordan.

Based on October 1, 2025 enrollment data, JSD includes:

- 42 elementary schools serving approximately 26,485 students;
- 13 middle schools serving approximately 13,703 students;
- 10 high schools and technical schools serving approximately 15,142 students; and
- 3 specialty schools serving approximately 489 students with varying special needs.

Based on March 2026 data, JSD serves approximately 6,462 multilingual students, including approximately 1,231 Newcomers who are within their first three years in the United States. JSD students represent approximately 80 countries and speak more than 56 languages.

JSD employs approximately 6,456 full-time and part-time staff members.

Additional information about JSD is available at <https://jordandistrict.org/>.

3. ISSUING OFFICE AND RFP SOLICITATION NUMBER

JSD is the conducting procurement unit for this RFP and any subsequent addenda. The solicitation number is **27BV13P5** and must be included on all proposals, correspondence, and documentation related to this solicitation.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

All questions **MUST** be submitted through Utah Public Procurement Place Bonfire (U3P Bonfire) at <https://utah.bonfirehub.com> during the designated question and answer (Q&A) period identified in U3P Bonfire. Questions submitted through any other channel will not be answered.

JSD may respond to questions individually or compile responses into an addendum issued after the Q&A period. All answers and addenda issued by JSD through U3P Bonfire shall constitute the official and binding position of JSD and may modify the specifications, requirements, or other provisions of this RFP.

Offerors are strongly encouraged to periodically review U3P Bonfire for posted questions, answers, and addenda prior to the proposal deadline. Each Offeror is responsible for ensuring that its proposal complies with this RFP and all applicable requirements contained in issued answers and addenda. Proposals that do not conform to such requirements may be considered nonresponsive.

Any concerns regarding ambiguity, inconsistency, excessively restrictive requirements, errors, or other issues within this solicitation **MUST** be submitted as a question through U3P Bonfire during the Q&A period. Issues not raised during the Q&A period may not be raised for the first time in an Offeror's proposal and may result in the proposal being considered nonresponsive.

5. ADDENDA

Any modification to this RFP will be made through an addendum issued by JSD. Offerors are strongly encouraged to periodically review U3P Bonfire for posted questions, answers, Public Notices, and addenda.

Information issued by JSD through U3P Bonfire as part of the Q&A process, by Public Notice, or through a formal addendum shall constitute the official and binding position of JSD. Addenda may modify the scope of work, schedule, qualification requirements, evaluation criteria, weighting, or other requirements of this RFP. Offerors are responsible for complying with all applicable addenda, and proposals that do not conform to revised requirements may be considered nonresponsive.

After the proposal due date and time, JSD may limit distribution of an addendum to Offerors that submitted proposals, provided JSD determines that the addendum does not constitute a substantial change that would likely have affected the number or identity of Offerors responding to the original solicitation.

Any proposal based on communications or information obtained from sources other than this RFP, official answers, Public Notices, or addenda issued by JSD may be considered nonresponsive and may be rejected at JSD's discretion.

6. RESTRICTIONS ON COMMUNICATIONS

From the issue date of this RFP until the Public Notice of Intent to Award is published, Offerors shall not communicate regarding this RFP with members of the RFP evaluation committee, the JSD Board of Education, JSD employees, or other individuals associated with this procurement, except for the JSD Buyer(s) identified as the official point(s) of contact for this RFP.

All communications regarding this RFP must be directed to the designated JSD Buyer(s) in accordance with the requirements of this solicitation. Failure to comply with this restriction may result in disqualification.

7. AWARD INTENT

JSD anticipates making a single award as a result of this RFP.

8. LENGTH OF CONTRACT

The contract resulting from this RFP shall have a single five (5) year term.

9. PRICE GUARANTEE PERIOD

The contract resulting from this RFP shall be a firm fixed-price contract. Offerors must provide firm pricing for the entire five (5) year contract term in accordance with the Cost Proposal Form (Attachment C).

10. DISCUSSIONS (FOR CLARIFICATION PURPOSES ONLY)

JSD may conduct discussions with Offerors whose proposals are determined to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for award for the limited purpose of clarifying proposal content. JSD reserves the right to make an award without conducting discussions.

11. STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS, EXCEPTIONS, AND NEGOTIATIONS

Any contract and purchase order resulting from this RFP will include the JSD Standard Terms and Conditions (see Attachment A), together with other applicable requirements of this RFP and the awarded Offeror's proposal, as incorporated into the resulting contract or purchase order.

Exceptions and/or additions to the JSD Standard Terms and Conditions are strongly discouraged. Offerors requesting exceptions and/or additions **must** submit all requested changes with their proposal in accordance with UAC R33-107-104(1). Exceptions and/or additions submitted after the proposal deadline will **not** be considered except as permitted by UAC R33-107-104(2). Offerors may submit questions regarding the JSD Standard Terms and Conditions during the Q&A period.

Offerors may not submit exceptions and/or additions by reference to an Offeror's website or URL, in accordance with UAC R33-107-104(3). Any requirement that JSD accept terms or conditions contained on an Offeror's website or incorporated by URL may result in the proposal being determined nonresponsive.

In accordance with UAC R33-107-104(4), JSD may decline to negotiate exceptions and/or additions that are excessive; inconsistent with similar contracts; relate to warranties, insurance, or indemnification provisions necessary to protect JSD after consultation with applicable legal counsel; are specifically prohibited by this solicitation; or are otherwise determined not to be in the best interest of JSD.

If negotiations are required, the Offeror must provide proposed contract revisions in Microsoft Word format using redline editing and must identify the individual(s) authorized to negotiate contractual terms on behalf of the Offeror. Any requirement that JSD accept an Offeror's terms and conditions as a condition of award may result in the proposal being determined nonresponsive.

Any award resulting from this RFP is subject to successful negotiation of applicable terms and conditions, if required. JSD will determine when negotiations have become unproductive and may discontinue negotiations with the selected Offeror and proceed with the next eligible Offeror, as permitted by applicable procurement law.

12. PROTECTED INFORMATION

The Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA), UCA 63G-2-305, provides in part that:

the following records are protected if properly classified by a governmental entity:

- (1) trade secrets as defined in Section 13-24-2 [Uniform Trade Secrets Act] if the person submitting the trade secret has provided the governmental entity with the information specified in Section 63G-2-309 [Confidentiality Claims];*
- (2) commercial information or nonindividual financial information obtained from a person if:*
 - (a) disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to result in unfair competitive injury to the person submitting the information or would impair the ability of the governmental entity to obtain necessary information in the future;*
 - (b) the person submitting the information has a greater interest in prohibiting access than the public in obtaining access; and*
 - (c) the person submitting the information has provided the governmental entity with the information specified in 63G-2-309 [Confidentiality Claims];*

* * * * *

- (6) records, the disclosure of which would impair governmental procurement proceedings or give an unfair advantage to any person proposing to enter into a contract or agreement with a governmental entity, except, subject to Subsections (1) and (2), that this Subsection (6) does not restrict the right of a person to have access to, after the contract or grant has been awarded and signed by all parties:*
 - (a) a bid, proposal, application, or other information submitted to or by a governmental entity in response to...*
 - (ii) a request for proposals...*

A. **PROCESS FOR REQUESTING NONDISCLOSURE**

Any Offeror requesting that information submitted with its proposal be protected from disclosure must complete and submit the **Claim of Business Confidentiality Form (see Attachment D)** with the proposal.

At a minimum, the Offeror must:

1. Submit a written Claim of Business Confidentiality at the time the information is provided to JSD;
2. Include a concise statement of the reasons supporting the claim of business confidentiality in accordance with UCA 63G-2-309(1); and
3. Submit an electronic redacted copy of the proposal with the protected information removed or obscured. The redacted copy must be clearly marked **"Redacted Version."**

Offerors may not classify price information as confidential or protected. Price information will be considered public information following award of the contract.

Offerors may not designate an entire proposal as **"PROTECTED," "CONFIDENTIAL," or "PROPRIETARY."** If an entire proposal is so designated, the proposal may be considered nonresponsive unless the designation is removed.

B. **REDACTED COPY**

If an Offeror's proposal contains information claimed to be business confidential or protected, the Offeror must submit one electronic redacted version of the proposal for public release. All information claimed to be protected must be blacked out or removed, and the redacted copy must be clearly marked **"Redacted Version."**

The Offeror acknowledges that its proposal may be subject to public disclosure in response to a request submitted under the Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA). If the Offeror submits a redacted copy, JSD may use that redacted copy when responding to a GRAMA request for the proposal.

If the Offeror fails to submit a redacted copy, JSD may release the Offeror's unredacted proposal in response to a GRAMA request, which may result in disclosure of information the Offeror considers confidential or proprietary.

Designations appearing only in a header, footer, watermark, or similar notation will not be considered sufficient to constitute a request for nondisclosure of protected or proprietary information.

13. BOYCOTT RESTRICTIONS

If applicable, Offerors must submit a signed **Public Contract Boycott Restrictions Statement (see Attachment B)** with their proposal.

In accordance with Utah Code Title 63G, Chapter 27, a public entity may not enter into certain contracts with a company unless the contract includes the certifications and agreements required by Utah Code § 63G-27-201.

As applicable, the awarded Offeror must certify that it is not currently engaged in a boycott of the State of Israel or an economic boycott, as those terms are defined in Utah Code § 63G-27-102. The awarded Offeror must also agree not to engage in a boycott of the State of Israel for the duration of the contract and must notify JSD in writing if it begins engaging in an economic boycott during the contract term.

These requirements apply only as provided in Utah Code § 63G-27-201, including any applicable exceptions.

14. COMPLIANCE WITH FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT (FERPA)

Because the proposed Solution may include software, online platform access, rostering, reporting tools, or other functionality involving student data, Offerors must submit a signed **Student Data Privacy Agreement (Attachment E)** with their proposal.

The signed Student Data Privacy Agreement is a mandatory minimum requirement. Failure to submit the signed Student Data Privacy Agreement may result in the proposal being deemed nonresponsive.

Questions regarding the Student Data Privacy Agreement, including any requested changes to the agreement, must be submitted through U3P Bonfire during the Q&A period.

15. DECLARATION OF DEBARMENT OR SUSPENSION

Offerors must disclose whether the Offeror, any related company, or any principal is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from contracting or soliciting work with any governmental department or agency.

Offerors must also disclose whether the Offeror or any principal has been terminated for default during the performance of a contract or has withdrawn from a contract to avoid termination or completion of the work.

If there is nothing to disclose, the Offeror shall provide a signed statement certifying that no such circumstances exist.

If any disclosure is required, or if the Offeror is unable to make the certification, the Offeror shall submit a written explanation describing the circumstances, including the applicable agency or contracting entity, the nature of the action, relevant dates, and the current status or resolution.

16. BEST AND FINAL OFFER

JSD does not anticipate conducting a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process. However, JSD may request Best and Final Offers when permitted by Utah Code § 63G-6a-707.5 and with the approval of the procurement official.

A BAFO process may be used only when:

1. No single proposal adequately addresses all specifications stated in the RFP;
2. All proposals are unclear or deficient in one or more respects;
3. All Cost Proposals exceed JSD's available funding; or
4. Two or more proposals receive an identical evaluation score that is the highest score.

Any request for Best and Final Offers will identify the specific issues Offerors are permitted to address and the manner in which the Best and Final Offers will be evaluated and scored.

A Best and Final Offer may be requested only from a responsible Offeror that submitted a responsive proposal meeting the applicable minimum mandatory criteria. A BAFO process may not be used to make a nonresponsive proposal responsive or to change a determination that an Offeror is not responsible.

Offerors should submit their most complete and competitive proposal in response to this RFP and should not anticipate an opportunity to revise or improve their proposal through a subsequent BAFO process.

17. COST PROPOSAL

All costs must be submitted on the **Cost Proposal Form (Attachment C)**. Offerors shall not alter, change, or modify the format of the Cost Proposal Form and must submit pricing in the exact format requested to allow for a fair and consistent comparison among Offerors.

Cost Proposal Forms that are altered, incomplete, or condition pricing on the acceptance of additional or conflicting terms, limitations, or qualifications may be considered nonresponsive.

The Cost Proposal will be evaluated independently from the Technical Proposal and **MUST** be submitted separately from the Technical Proposal.

Inclusion of any cost or pricing information within the Technical Proposal will result in the proposal being deemed nonresponsive in accordance with Utah Code § 63G-6a-707(7).

18. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING THE RFP

To be considered responsive, Offerors must submit proposals **BOTH electronically through U3P Bonfire AND in hard copy** as described below. Failure to submit through both required methods may result in the proposal being deemed nonresponsive.

Submission Deadline

Both the electronic submission and hard copy submission must be received by the deadline posted on U3P Bonfire.

Proposals received after the deadline will be considered late and will not be evaluated. Offerors are solely responsible for ensuring timely submission and delivery. Transmission delays, delivery service errors, technical issues, or other similar circumstances will not excuse a late submission.

Proposals will not be accepted by email or fax.

A. ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION THROUGH U3P BONFIRE — REQUIRED

Offerors must submit an electronic proposal through U3P Bonfire in addition to the required hard copy submission.

All required online forms must be completed and all required proposal documents must be fully uploaded before the submission deadline. The solicitation will close at the specified deadline, and files that have not been completely uploaded at the time of closing may be considered late and ineligible.

Electronic File Requirements

- Each required proposal document must be uploaded as a separate file.
- U3P Bonfire accepts standard document formats supported by the system.
- Do **not** submit ZIP files, video files, WMP files, MP3 files, encrypted files, or other unsupported file formats.

Required Electronic Proposal Documents

Offerors must submit the following electronic files:

1. **Technical Proposal**, labeled:
"Solicitation #27BV13P5 – Technical Proposal"
2. **Cost Proposal (Attachment C)**, labeled:
"Solicitation #27BV13P5 – Cost Proposal"
3. **Redacted Technical Proposal, if applicable**, labeled:
"Solicitation #27BV13P5 – Redacted Technical Proposal"

B. HARD COPY SUBMISSION — REQUIRED

Offerors must also submit the required hard copy materials. Hard copy submissions must be received by the posted deadline and will be date- and time-stamped upon receipt.

Delivery Address

Jordan School District
Purchasing Department
Attn: Brenda Veldevere
7905 South Redwood Road
West Jordan, Utah 84088

Required Hard Copy Materials

Offerors must submit:

1. **Technical Proposal** — Seven (7) printed copies, labeled:
"Solicitation #27BV13P5 – Technical Proposal"
2. **Cost Proposal (Attachment C)** — One (1) sealed copy, labeled:
"Solicitation #27BV13P5 – Cost Proposal"

Packaging Requirements

- The Cost Proposal must be submitted in a separately sealed envelope.
- Technical Proposal copies do not need to be individually sealed.
- All required materials may be enclosed within one outer package for delivery.

19. OFFEROR'S UNDERSTANDING OF RFP

By submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, the Offeror acknowledges that it has reviewed and understands the requirements, Scope of Work, evaluation process, attachments, and all other documents incorporated into or referenced by this RFP.

The Offeror further acknowledges that it is responsible for submitting a complete and responsive proposal and, if awarded a contract, for complying with the requirements of this RFP and the resulting contract.

All costs incurred by an Offeror in preparing and submitting a proposal, including costs associated with any Virtual Product Demonstration or other participation in the evaluation process, are the sole responsibility of the Offeror and will not be reimbursed by JSD.

20. FIRM PROPOSAL OFFER PERIOD

Proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall constitute firm offers and shall remain valid and binding for one hundred twenty (120) calendar days from the proposal due date.

During this period, an Offeror may not withdraw, modify, or alter its proposal except as permitted by the Utah Procurement Code and applicable administrative rules.

21. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE

The following schedule is anticipated and is subject to change at JSD's discretion. Any changes to the solicitation schedule will be communicated through U3P Bonfire, as applicable.

EVENT	DATE	TIME
Deadline for Questions	Thursday, October 1, 2026	3:00 p.m. MDT
Proposal Due – Electronic Submission and Required Hard Copies	Thursday, October 8, 2026	3:00 p.m. MDT
Technical Evaluation Period	Friday, October 9, 2026	TBD
Virtual Product Demonstration	Wednesday, October 14, 2026	TBD
Anticipated Approval by JSD Board of Education	Tuesday, October 27, 2026	6:30 p.m.

[This space intentionally left blank.]

PART 2: MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

1. PURPOSE

This section identifies the mandatory minimum requirements that must be met for a proposal to be considered responsive. All requirements in this section are nonnegotiable.

Failure to meet any mandatory minimum requirement may result in the proposal being deemed nonresponsive during Stage 1: Determination of Responsiveness or at any later point in the evaluation process. Proposals determined to be nonresponsive will not be considered further and will not be eligible for award.

A. COMPLIANCE WITH UTAH CODE TITLE 63G, CHAPTER 27, PUBLIC CONTRACT BOYCOTT RESTRICTIONS

To demonstrate compliance with this mandatory minimum requirement, the Offeror must submit:

1. A signed Public Contract Boycott Restrictions Statement (Attachment B).
-

B. DECLARATION OF DEBARMENT OR SUSPENSION

To demonstrate compliance with this mandatory minimum requirement, the Offeror must submit one of the following:

1. **If there is something to disclose:** A written explanation describing any debarment, suspension, ineligibility, voluntary exclusion, contract termination, or withdrawal from a contract involving the Offeror, any related company, or any principal; or
 2. **If there is nothing to disclose:** A signed statement certifying that the Offeror, any related company, and any principal have nothing to disclose.
-

C. COMPLIANCE WITH THE FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT (FERPA)

To demonstrate compliance with this mandatory minimum requirement, the Offeror must submit:

1. A signed Student Data Privacy Agreement (Attachment E).
-

D. DATA INTEROPERABILITY WITH JSD'S EXISTING ELLEVATION PLATFORM

To demonstrate compliance with this mandatory minimum requirement, the Offeror must submit:

1. A signed statement confirming that the proposed Solution can securely and reliably exchange the required student-level assessment data with JSD's existing Ellevation Platform; and
 2. Identification of at least one (1) K-12 client in the United States for which the Offeror has successfully implemented data exchange between the proposed assessment Solution and the Ellevation Platform.
-

E. AVAILABILITY FOR VIRTUAL PRODUCT DEMONSTRATION

To demonstrate compliance with this mandatory minimum requirement, the Offeror must submit:

1. A written confirmation that, if the Offeror advances to Stage 3, it will be available to participate in the **Virtual Product Demonstration on Wednesday, October 14, 2026**.

The confirmation must identify the individual JSD should contact to coordinate scheduling and Virtual Product Demonstration details and include the following:

- Name
- Title
- Phone number
- Email address

The specific demonstration time will be determined by JSD. Following completion of the Technical Proposal evaluation, JSD will provide participating Offerors with the Virtual Product Demonstration instructions, evaluation questions or demonstration requirements, and the maximum points assigned to each question or requirement.

[This space intentionally left blank.]

PART 3: SCOPE OF WORK

1. PURPOSE

Jordan School District (JSD) requires a web-based formative and benchmark English Language Proficiency Assessment Solution for Multilingual Learners (the "Solution") to supplement the District's existing Curriculum Associates Ellevation Platform. The Solution is intended to support ongoing assessment of student English language proficiency, progress monitoring, and instructional decision-making and is not intended to replace the State-required summative English language proficiency assessment.

The selected Offeror shall provide the Solution and all licensing, implementation, configuration, data interoperability, reporting, training, support, and related services necessary for successful District use.

2. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

JSD serves approximately 6,462 multilingual students, including approximately 1,231 Newcomers who are within their first three years in the United States. Students represent approximately 80 countries and speak more than 56 languages.

JSD currently uses Curriculum Associates Ellevation to support multilingual learner program management, instructional support, and family communication. The District's existing Ellevation environment includes:

- Ellevation Platform – provides multilingual learner program management, student data management, monitoring, compliance support, progress tracking, and reporting;
- Ellevation Strategies – provides instructional strategies, activities, and classroom supports to assist educators in meeting the language and academic needs of multilingual learners; and
- Ellevation Family Communication – supports communication with multilingual learner families through translated notices, forms, digital communications, signatures, and communication tracking.

The Solution selected through this RFP will add a formative and benchmark English language proficiency assessment component and supplement the District's existing Ellevation environment. JSD is NOT seeking to replace Ellevation Platform, Ellevation Strategies, or Ellevation Family Communication through this solicitation.

The selected Solution must provide assessment results that can be used by teachers, multilingual learner specialists, school administrators, and District personnel to understand student English language proficiency and growth and to support instructional and programmatic decision-making. Student-level assessment results generated by the selected Solution must also be made available within JSD's existing Ellevation Platform through a secure and reliable data-exchange process.

3. ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

The Solution shall:

1. Provide a web-based English language proficiency and/or language-development formative and benchmark assessment appropriate for multilingual learners;
2. Support assessment in Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing;
3. Support students in grades K–12 across a range of English proficiency levels, including Newcomers and beginning English learners;
4. Align with recognized English language development or English language proficiency standards or frameworks and provide information describing the relationship of the proposed assessment to the WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework, proficiency levels, and/or WIDA assessment scores, as applicable;
5. Provide valid and reliable results appropriate for the intended uses of the Solution;
6. Provide assessment results that are developed and validated using appropriate practices related to fairness, bias, accessibility, and appropriate score use for multilingual learner populations;
7. Support measurement of student English language proficiency and/or growth over time;
8. Provide appropriate accommodations and accessibility supports; and
9. Minimize unnecessary loss of instructional time through efficient assessment administration.

The Solution will be primarily used for benchmarking, progress monitoring, identifying student strengths and areas of need, informing instruction and intervention, student grouping and goal setting, and multilingual learner program decision-making.

The Solution is not intended to replace any State-required English language proficiency assessment unless expressly authorized by applicable law and JSD.

4. ADMINISTRATION, SCORING, AND REPORTING

The Solution shall provide:

1. Assessment administration appropriate for K–12 school environments;
2. Secure student access and appropriate test-administration controls;
3. Timely scoring and availability of assessment results;
4. Student-level and aggregate reporting appropriate for teachers, multilingual learner specialists, school administrators, and District personnel;
5. Overall and domain-level results, as supported by the assessment design;
6. Growth and/or progress information over time, where applicable;
7. Teacher-facing reporting and tools that allow educators to readily interpret assessment results and use the information to support instructional planning, differentiation, intervention, student grouping, goal setting, and targeted language support; and
8. Data export in commonly used electronic formats.

5. ELLEVATION DATA INTEROPERABILITY

The Solution shall provide a secure, reliable, sustainable, and reasonably efficient method for making required student-level assessment results available for use within JSD's existing Curriculum Associates Ellevation Platform.

A proprietary or native Ellevation integration is **not required**. Acceptable methods may include direct integration, API, secure file transfer, standardized import/export, or another secure data-exchange process that meets JSD's operational requirements.

JSD reserves the right to verify the proposed method of interoperability with the Ellevation Platform prior to award.

6. ROSTERING, ACCESS, AND TECHNICAL INTEROPERABILITY

The Solution shall support District-scale account administration and provide appropriate capabilities for student and staff rostering, user provisioning, authentication and/or single sign-on, organizational hierarchy management, and data exchange with commonly used K-12 systems.

Any required third-party products, connectors, or services must be clearly identified in the proposal and included in the Cost Proposal Form, as applicable.

7. ACCESSIBILITY, PRIVACY, SECURITY, AND AUTOMATED TECHNOLOGIES

The Solution shall:

1. Be accessible and usable by JSD students and staff and support applicable accessibility requirements;
2. Comply with applicable federal and Utah student data privacy and security requirements;
3. Protect District and student data through appropriate technical, administrative, and organizational safeguards;
4. Provide for the secure return, export, or destruction of JSD data upon contract expiration or termination; and
5. Disclose the use of artificial intelligence, machine learning, automated scoring, generative AI, or similar technologies when such technologies affect assessment administration, scoring, feedback, reporting, or student data.

JSD data shall not be sold, used for targeted advertising, or used for purposes unrelated to providing the contracted Solution, except as expressly authorized by law and JSD.

8. IMPLEMENTATION AND TRAINING

The selected Offeror shall provide implementation, configuration, testing, and launch support necessary for successful District-wide use of the Solution, including establishment and validation of the required data exchange with JSD's existing Ellevation Platform.

The selected Solution must be fully implemented, tested, and available for District use by Monday, **November 23, 2026**.

Implementation shall include, as applicable, Solution configuration, user and organizational setup, rostering, authentication and/or single sign-on, Ellevation Platform data-exchange setup and validation, testing, quality assurance, training, and other activities necessary for successful launch.

The selected Offeror shall provide sufficient training and resources for appropriate JSD personnel to administer assessments, manage the Solution, access and interpret results, and use assessment information effectively.

9. TECHNICAL SUPPORT AND SYSTEM RELIABILITY

The selected Offeror shall provide ongoing technical support, customer support, and account management throughout the contract term, including support appropriate for assessment administration and other critical operational periods.

The Solution shall provide system availability, capacity, maintenance, change-management, backup, disaster-recovery, and business-continuity practices appropriate for District-wide K-12 use.

10. LICENSING, DATA OWNERSHIP, AND PORTABILITY

The selected Offeror shall provide all licensing necessary for the awarded scope and shall clearly identify all required one-time and recurring charges in the Cost Proposal Form.

JSD shall retain ownership of District-provided data and student-level data generated through JSD's use of the Solution, to the extent permitted by law. JSD shall have the ability to export and retain assessment results and related District data in a reasonably usable electronic format during the contract term and upon contract expiration or termination.

11. DISTRICT-LEVEL ASSESSMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

The Solution shall provide District-level administrative capabilities appropriate for managing assessment activities across multiple schools, grade levels, and student groups.

The Solution shall support, as applicable, District-wide configuration and management of testing windows and assessment assignments; monitoring of assessment participation, completion, and testing progress; management of student roster changes; and identification of students who have been assigned, are due to complete, or have not completed an assessment within the Solution.

If the Solution uses a per-assessment, per-administration, consumption-based, or similar licensing model, the Solution shall provide JSD with the ability to monitor assessments or licenses purchased, assigned, used, and remaining.

The Solution shall also provide appropriate administrative roles, permissions, and controls to allow JSD to centrally manage the Solution while delegating functions to schools or other authorized users, as appropriate.

[This space intentionally left blank.]

PART 4: INFORMATION REQUIRED IN SUBMISSION OF A PROPOSAL

1. RFP TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT

Proposal responses shall be concise, complete, and clearly organized to facilitate evaluation.

All materials submitted in response to this RFP become the property of JSD. Proposals may be reviewed and evaluated by individuals designated by JSD to serve on the RFP evaluation committee and may be returned only at JSD's discretion.

To assist JSD in evaluating proposals accurately and efficiently, Offerors shall submit responses with consecutive page numbers and clearly labeled tabs corresponding to each required proposal section identified below.

For hard copy submissions, Offerors are encouraged to submit the Technical Proposal in a **spiral-bound format** to facilitate review by the evaluation committee.

Failure to comply with the required proposal format or submission instructions may result in the proposal being deemed nonresponsive.

A. TAB TITLE: Vendor Information

Offerors shall provide the following under this tab:

1. A completed and signed W-9 Form;
2. A completed Vendor Information Sheet; and
3. A completed and signed URS Post-Retirement Verification Form (Attachment F).

B. TAB TITLE: Letter of Transmittal (Limit Two (2) Pages)

Offerors shall provide a Letter of Transmittal under this tab that includes:

1. The Offeror's legal name, address, telephone number, and the name, title, telephone number, and email address of the primary contact for the proposal;
2. Identification of the individual(s) authorized to represent the Offeror regarding the proposal;
3. A statement confirming the Offeror's intent and commitment to provide the Solution described in this RFP;
4. A statement acknowledging that the Offeror has read, understands, and agrees to comply with the requirements of this RFP; and
5. The signature of an individual authorized to legally bind the Offeror.

C. TAB TITLE: Table of Contents

Offerors shall provide a Table of Contents under this tab that clearly identifies each section of the proposal response and the corresponding page number(s).

The Table of Contents shall follow the required proposal format, **Tabs A through H**, in the order presented in this RFP.

D. TAB TITLE: Protected or Proprietary Information

Offerors shall provide the following under this tab, as applicable:

1. A completed Claim of Business Confidentiality Form (Attachment D) clearly identifying all information claimed to be protected or proprietary; and
2. An electronic redacted copy of the proposal submitted at the same time as the original proposal. The redacted copy must comply with all applicable requirements of this RFP.

If the proposal does not contain any information claimed to be protected or proprietary, the Offeror shall indicate **"None"** in this section.

Offerors are responsible for complying with the requirements of Part 1, Section 13 – Protected Information. Failure to properly identify, claim, or redact protected or proprietary information may result in disclosure of that information in accordance with applicable law.

E. TAB TITLE: Potential Conflicts of Interest

Offerors shall disclose under this tab any actual or potential conflicts of interest that may arise in connection with the performance of the services described in this RFP or any resulting contract.

If no actual or potential conflicts of interest are identified or anticipated, the Offeror shall indicate **"None"** in this section.

F. TAB TITLE: Exceptions and/or Additions to the JSD Standard Terms and Conditions

Offerors shall provide under this tab any proposed exceptions and/or additions to the JSD Standard Terms and Conditions (Attachment A).

JSD expects Offerors to accept the JSD Standard Terms and Conditions without modification. Exceptions and/or additions are strongly discouraged and may result in the proposal being deemed nonresponsive if JSD determines that they are material, prohibited, inconsistent with the requirements of this RFP, or not in JSD's best interest.

If an Offeror determines that an exception or addition is necessary, it must be clearly identified and documented in this section. All proposed exceptions and/or additions must:

- be submitted in Microsoft Word format using redline editing; and
- include the name and contact information of the individual authorized to negotiate contractual terms on behalf of the Offeror.

If there are no proposed exceptions or additions, the Offeror shall indicate **"None"** in this section.

G. TAB TITLE: Mandatory Minimum Requirements (Pass/Fail)

Offerors shall provide under this tab all documentation required by Part 2: Mandatory Minimum Requirements, including:

- A. Compliance with Utah Code Title 63G, Chapter 27 – Public Contract Boycott Restrictions;
- B. Declaration of Debarment or Suspension;
- C. Compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA);
- D. Data Interoperability with JSD's Existing Ellevation Platform; and
- E. Availability for Virtual Product Demonstration.

H. TAB TITLE: Detailed Technical Proposal Response (Scored Criteria)

Offerors shall provide under this tab a detailed narrative response to each Proposal Evaluation Question identified in the Technical Proposal Evaluation Questions Matrix.

The matrix is organized into Sections A through D and includes Questions A1–A8, B1–B7, C1–C5, and D1–D3. Each evaluation question identifies the maximum number of points available for that response.

Responses must be provided in the exact order listed in the Technical Proposal Evaluation Questions Matrix. For each response, the Offeror shall:

1. Restate the question reference number;
2. Restate the full evaluation question; and

3. Provide a detailed narrative response addressing all required elements identified in the evaluation question.

Each response will be evaluated based on the extent to which it:

- clearly and completely addresses all required elements identified in the evaluation question;
- provides a relevant, specific, credible, and sufficiently detailed response; and
- demonstrates the Offeror's ability to meet the requirement described in the evaluation question.

References to supporting documentation may not be used in place of a substantive narrative response. Supporting documentation will be considered only to the extent that it supports or validates the information provided in the narrative response.

Technical Proposal Evaluation Questions Matrix

Sections A-D Scored Criteria, 600 Points Possible

A. ASSESSMENT SOLUTION, EDUCATIONAL APPROACH, AND TECHNICAL QUALITY <i>(220 Total Possible Points)</i> <i>This section evaluates the Offeror's understanding of JSD's multilingual learner assessment objectives; the design, quality, and educational approach of the proposed Solution; the Solution's ability to assess Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing across applicable grade levels and proficiency levels; the validity, reliability, fairness, and technical quality of the assessment; and the accessibility, administration, scoring, student experience, teacher experience, and instructional use of the Solution.</i>	
A1. Solution Fit with JSD's Multilingual Learner Assessment Objectives Provide a detailed narrative explaining how the proposed Solution fits JSD's intended assessment purpose and existing multilingual learner environment. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. How the Solution will supplement JSD's existing multilingual learner environment, which includes Ellevation Platform, Ellevation Strategies, and Ellevation Family Communication, without replacing those existing solutions;	25 points possible

2. How the assessment will support benchmarking, progress monitoring, and instructional decision-making; 3. How the Solution will support JSD’s multilingual learners in grades K-12 across varying English proficiency levels; and 4. How the proposed Solution is suited for implementation and ongoing use in a large K–12 school district.	
A2. Assessment Design, Language Domains, and Standards Alignment Provide a detailed narrative describing the proposed assessment design and approach to measuring Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Grade levels and English proficiency levels supported, including K–12, Newcomers, beginning English learners, and students across varying levels of English proficiency; 2. Overall assessment design, including item/task types and adaptive or fixed-form methodology, as applicable; 3. How Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing are assessed; and 4. Alignment to recognized English language development or proficiency standards/frameworks, including the relationship to WIDA English Language Development Standards, proficiency levels, and/or WIDA assessment scores and any available correlation studies, alignment studies, crosswalks, or other supporting evidence.	40 points possible
A3. Validity, Reliability, and Measurement Quality Provide a detailed narrative describing the validity, reliability, and overall measurement quality of the proposed assessment. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Validity evidence; 2. Reliability and measurement precision; 3. Scaling and score comparability; 4. Proficiency classification or standard-setting methodology, if applicable; and 5. Growth measurement methodology.	35 points possible
A4. Fairness, Bias, and Appropriate Score Use	20 points possible

Provide a detailed narrative describing how the proposed assessment supports fair and appropriate use of assessment results across JSD's diverse multilingual learner population. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Fairness and bias analyses; 2. Subgroup analyses; 3. Evidence that the assessment design and validation process considers accessibility and potential differential impacts on students with disabilities or other accessibility needs; 4. Uses for which assessment scores are validated; 5. Uses for which assessment scores are not validated; and 6. Known limitations affecting interpretation or use of results.	
A5. Assessment Administration, Scoring, and Results Availability Provide a detailed narrative describing the assessment administration model, scoring methodology, and availability of results. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Recommended assessment schedule and frequency, estimated testing time by applicable grade level or proficiency level, and how unnecessary loss of instructional time is minimized; 2. Student access, authentication, test security, session-management requirements, and procedures for interrupted or make-up testing; 3. Device, browser, audio, microphone, and other technical requirements for assessment administration; 4. Scoring methodology, including automated and human scoring processes and how Speaking and Writing responses are scored; and 5. Turnaround time for scoring and results availability.	25 points possible
A6. Student Experience and Accommodations Provide a detailed narrative describing how the Solution provides an appropriate and accessible assessment experience for JSD students. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Accessibility standards supported; 2. Available accommodations and designated supports; 3. Usability for young learners; 4. Usability for students at beginning levels of English proficiency;	20 points possible

5. Compatibility with assistive technologies; and 6. Known limitations or exceptions.	
A7. Teacher Assessment Administration and User Experience Provide a detailed narrative describing the end-to-end teacher experience with the proposed Solution when preparing for, assigning, administering, and managing assessments. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. How teachers schedule, assign, launch, monitor, and manage assessments, including make-up, interrupted, or reassigned assessments; 2. What decisions teachers may make regarding the selection of assessment domains, proficiency levels, tiers, forms, or other assessment components, as applicable to the proposed Solution, for individual students or groups of students, and any limitations on those decisions; 3. Teacher responsibilities and steps required before, during, and after assessment administration; 4. Available accessibility features, accommodations, designated supports, or other assessment supports, including how teachers identify, configure, or apply applicable supports for individual students; and 5. The level of technical knowledge, administrative effort, and ongoing teacher involvement typically required to administer and manage assessments effectively.	25 points possible
A8. Teacher-Facing Reporting and Instructional Use Provide a detailed narrative describing how teachers access, interpret, and use assessment results to support multilingual learner instruction and progress monitoring. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Teacher-facing dashboards and reports, including individual student, classroom/group, overall, and language-domain results; 2. How the Solution identifies student strengths, areas of need, skill performance, and language-development needs; 3. How assessment results support instructional decision-making, including student grouping, goal setting, differentiation, intervention, progress monitoring, and targeted language-development support; 4. Whether the Solution provides instructional recommendations, suggested next steps, resources, or other guidance based on assessment results and, if so, how those	30 points possible

recommendations are generated and presented to teachers; and 5. How easily teachers can move from assessment results to actionable instructional information without requiring extensive manual data analysis or additional systems.	
--	--

B. ELLEVATION INTEGRATION, DATA INTEROPERABILITY, REPORTING, AND SECURITY

(180 Total Possible Points)

This section evaluates the proposed Solution's ability to securely and effectively exchange assessment data with JSD's existing Ellevation Platform; provide useful reporting and analytics; support District-level assessment administration and program management; support rostering, authentication, provisioning, and system interoperability requirements; provide appropriate administrative roles, permissions, configuration, and system oversight; and protect student and District data through appropriate privacy, cybersecurity, data-governance, and automated-technology practices.

B1. Ellevation Platform Integration and Data Exchange

45 points possible

Provide a detailed narrative describing how student-level assessment data from the proposed Solution will be made available within JSD's existing Ellevation Platform.

At a minimum, the response must address:

1. The proposed method for exchanging student-level assessment data with the Ellevation Platform, including whether native/direct integration is available and any alternative secure data-exchange methods;
2. The level of automation, anticipated transfer frequency, and data fields and formats to be exchanged;
3. APIs, secure file transfer, data standards, templates, connectors, third-party products, or services required to support the data exchange; and
4. The anticipated responsibilities of the Offeror, JSD, and Curriculum Associates in establishing, validating, maintaining, and supporting the Ellevation Platform data exchange, including procedures for identifying, monitoring, troubleshooting, and correcting data-exchange errors, and any known limitations or dependencies.

B2. Reporting, Analytics, and Data Use Provide a detailed narrative describing the Solution’s reporting and analytics capabilities for student, school, and District use. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Available student-level, school-level, and District-level reports, including overall and language-domain results; 2. Growth and progress reporting over time, including available filters, comparisons, and disaggregation capabilities; 3. Dashboards, visualizations, data-export capabilities, and available export formats; and 4. The ability of authorized users to access, filter, analyze, and compare assessment results across applicable schools, grade levels, student groups, proficiency levels, assessment periods, and language domains.	25 points possible
B3. Rostering, SSO, and Interoperability Provide a detailed narrative describing the Solution’s rosters, authentication, provisioning, and system-integration capabilities. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Student and staff rosters, user provisioning, and account-management capabilities; 2. Single sign-on and authentication options; 3. APIs, supported data standards, and integration capabilities with commonly used K–12 systems; 4. Organizational hierarchy and school-level administration capabilities; and 5. Required third-party products, connectors, or additional services, including known interoperability limitations or technical dependencies.	20 points possible
B4. Data Privacy and Cybersecurity Provide a detailed narrative describing the Offeror’s approach to student data privacy, cybersecurity, and data governance. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Data collected and the purpose for which each category of data is used; 2. Data hosting environment and subprocessors; 3. Encryption, authentication security controls, and protections against unauthorized access;	25 points possible

4. Security monitoring, incident detection, and incident-response procedures; 5. Data retention, return, and deletion practices; and 6. Independent security assessments, certifications, or third-party audits.	
B5. AI, Automated Scoring, and Model Use Provide a detailed narrative describing any use of artificial intelligence, machine learning, automated scoring, generative AI, or similar technologies within the proposed Solution. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. AI, machine learning, automated scoring, or generative AI functionality used within the Solution; 2. How such technologies affect assessment administration, scoring, feedback, reporting, or student data; 3. Validation and quality-control processes for automated scoring or AI-supported functionality; 4. Human review or oversight processes, where applicable; 5. Whether JSD data is used to train, improve, or develop general-purpose or vendor models; and 6. Known limitations or risks associated with the use of automated technologies.	15 points possible
B6. District-Level Assessment Administration and Program Management Provide a detailed narrative describing the capabilities available to District-level assessment coordinators and multilingual learner program administrators to centrally plan, manage, and monitor assessment activities across JSD. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. District-wide assessment administration capabilities, including creation and configuration of testing windows, assessment schedules, schools, grade levels, student groups, and, as applicable to the proposed Solution, assessment domains, proficiency levels, tiers, forms, or other assessment components; 2. The level of District control over assessment assignments and administration, including which functions may be established centrally and which may be delegated to schools or teachers; 3. District-wide monitoring capabilities, including dashboards or reports showing assessment assignment, participation,	30 points possible

completion status, testing progress, interrupted assessments, and other applicable administration information; 4. Tools for identifying students who have been assigned, are due to complete, or have not completed an assessment, including students who enroll, transfer, or are added to the multilingual learner program after an assessment window has begun; 5. How District administrators manage student and staff roster changes, including newly enrolled students, transfers, withdrawals, school changes, and other roster updates; and 6. Tools for monitoring assessment usage or consumption, including the number of assessments assigned, started, completed, or remaining when licensing or pricing is based in whole or in part on assessment usage.	
B7. Administrative Roles, Permissions and System Oversight Provide a detailed narrative describing the Solution’s administrative governance, access-control, audit, and system-oversight capabilities. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Administrative roles, permissions, and access controls available for District, school, and other authorized personnel; 2. The ability to create or assign differentiated levels of administrative access based on role, responsibility, school, or organizational level; 3. Administrative audit logs, activity histories, or other capabilities for tracking administrative actions and system changes; 4. Configuration settings and controls available to JSD administrators, including identification of settings or changes that require Offeror assistance; 5. Tools or processes available to District administrators for identifying, investigating, and escalating system, access, configuration, or data-related issues; and 6. Known limitations on District-level administrative access, permissions, configuration, or system oversight.	20 points possible

C. IMPLEMENTATION, TRAINING, SUPPORT, AND LONG-TERM SERVICE*(150 Total Possible Points)*

This section evaluates the Offeror's approach to timely implementation and launch of the proposed Solution; providing training and professional learning; delivering ongoing customer support and account management; maintaining system reliability, scalability, and continuity; and supporting JSD's long-term access to, portability of, and transition of District assessment data.

C1. Implementation and Launch Plan**45 points possible**

Provide a detailed narrative describing the proposed implementation and launch plan from contract award through successful District-wide use of the Solution, including how the Offeror will meet JSD's required implementation date of **Monday, November 23, 2026**.

At a minimum, the response must address:

1. Major implementation phases, timeline, and key milestones;
2. The Offeror's ability and approach to meeting JSD's required implementation date;
3. Roles and responsibilities of the Offeror and JSD;
4. Configuration, user setup, rostering, and single sign-on implementation;
5. Ellevation Platform data-exchange setup, validation, testing, and quality-assurance activities; and
6. Key risks, dependencies, and mitigation strategies.

C2. Training and Professional Learning**30 points possible**

Provide a detailed narrative describing the proposed training and professional learning approach for JSD personnel.

At a minimum, the response must address:

1. Training for administrators, teachers, multilingual learner specialists, assessment coordinators, and other applicable users;
2. Initial implementation training and available training delivery formats;
3. Training related to assessment administration, interpretation of results, and instructional use;
4. Training materials, guides, recordings, refresher training, and other ongoing professional learning resources; and
5. Any limitations, additional fees, or conditions associated with training services.

C3. Customer Support and Account Management**25 points possible**

Provide a detailed narrative describing the Offeror's customer support, technical support, and account-management approach throughout the contract term. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. Customer and technical support channels and hours of availability; 2. Support availability during assessment windows; 3. Escalation procedures and response/resolution expectations; 4. Assigned account-management resources; 5. System-status, outage, and other service communications; and 6. Ongoing service-review and account-management practices.	
C4. System Reliability, Product Management, and Continuity Provide a detailed narrative describing the Solution's system reliability, scalability, product-management practices, and continuity protections. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. System availability, uptime expectations, scalability, and capacity for District-wide use; 2. Scheduled and unscheduled maintenance practices; 3. Software release and change-management processes, including communication of material product or functionality changes; 4. Backup, disaster-recovery, and business-continuity practices; and 5. Known service limitations or dependencies that could affect system availability or District use.	25 points possible
C5. Data Ownership, Portability, and Contract Transition Provide a detailed narrative describing how JSD will access, export, retain, and transition District assessment data during the contract term and upon expiration or termination. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. JSD's access to District and student assessment data during the contract term, including available data-export methods and formats; 2. Data-retention capabilities; 3. Procedures and timelines for returning or exporting District data upon contract expiration or termination; 4. Data-deletion procedures and assistance available to support transition to another solution; and 5. Known limitations or fees associated with data export, retention, portability, transition, or termination services.	25 points possible

D. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE, PAST PERFORMANCE, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY

(50 Total Possible Points)

This section evaluates the depth, relevance, and quality of the Offeror's K–12 multilingual learner assessment experience, demonstrated past performance, prior Ellevation Platform data-exchange experience, and organizational capacity to successfully implement and support the proposed Solution for a school district of JSD's size and complexity.

D1. Relevant K–12 and Ellevation Experience Provide a detailed narrative describing the Offeror's relevant experience implementing and supporting English language proficiency and/or language-development assessment solutions in K–12 school districts, including prior successful experience exchanging assessment data with the Ellevation Platform. At a minimum, the response must address: 1. The K–12 client identified under the Mandatory Minimum Requirements for which the Offeror has successfully implemented data exchange between the proposed assessment Solution and the Ellevation Platform; 2. The approximate size, grade levels, multilingual learner population, and scope of that implementation; 3. The length of time the proposed assessment Solution and Ellevation data exchange have been in operation; 4. The method of data exchange used with the Ellevation Platform and the level of automation involved; 5. Relevant experience supporting other large or complex K–12 assessment implementations, including multi-school or District-wide use; and 6. How the Offeror's prior K–12 and Ellevation experience is relevant to JSD's proposed implementation.	15 points possible
D2. Demonstrated Results and Past Performance Provide a detailed narrative describing the Offeror's demonstrated results and past performance for the Ellevation implementation identified in D1 and other relevant K–12 implementations. At a minimum, the response must address:	15 points possible

- Whether the assessment Solution and Ellevation data exchange were implemented successfully and on schedule; - Client adoption and ongoing use of the assessment Solution; - Reliability and ongoing performance of the Ellevation data exchange; - System reliability, service quality, and ongoing support performance; - Significant implementation, technical, Ellevation data-exchange, or performance issues encountered; and - How those issues were identified, resolved, and prevented from recurring.	
D3. Key Personnel and Organizational Capacity Provide a detailed narrative describing the key personnel and organizational resources that will be available to implement and support the proposed Solution and required Ellevation data exchange for JSD. At a minimum, the response must address: - The name, role, responsibilities, and relevant qualifications of key personnel assigned to JSD; - Relevant experience of assigned personnel implementing and supporting K–12 assessment solutions; - Relevant experience of assigned personnel implementing and supporting Ellevation Platform data-exchange processes; - Organizational resources available to support implementation, Ellevation data exchange, and ongoing technical operation of the proposed Solution; - Capacity to support a District-wide implementation for an organization of JSD’s size and complexity; and - The approach to maintaining continuity of service if key personnel or organizational resources change.	20 points possible

2. RFP COST PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT

All costs must be submitted on the **Cost Proposal Form (Attachment C)**. Offerors shall not alter, change, or modify the format of the Cost Proposal Form and must submit pricing in the exact format provided to allow for a fair and consistent comparison among Offerors.

Cost Proposal Forms that are incomplete, altered from the required format, contain conditions or qualifications not requested by JSD, condition pricing on the acceptance of additional or conflicting terms, or otherwise fail to comply with the Cost Proposal Form instructions may result in the proposal being deemed nonresponsive.

The Cost Proposal will be evaluated independently from the Technical Proposal and must be submitted separately from the Technical Proposal.

Offerors must not include any cost or pricing information in the Technical Proposal.

Inclusion of any cost or pricing information within the Technical Proposal will result in the proposal being deemed nonresponsive in accordance with Utah Code Ann. § 63G-6a-707(7).

[This space intentionally left blank.]

PART 5: RFP EVALUATION AND AWARD

1. RFP EVALUATION PROCESS

All proposals submitted in response to this RFP will be evaluated in accordance with the Utah Procurement Code, applicable Utah Administrative Code, JSD purchasing policies, and the evaluation criteria established in this RFP.

Offerors are solely responsible for ensuring that their proposals are complete and include all information required for evaluation.

The evaluation process will consist of the following stages:

- **Stage 1:** Determination of Responsiveness – Pass/Fail
- **Stage 2:** Technical Proposal Evaluation – 600 points
- **Stage 3:** Virtual Product Demonstration – 100 points
- **Stage 4:** Cost Proposal Evaluation – 300 points

The maximum total evaluation score is **1,000 points**.

A. **STAGE 1: DETERMINATION OF RESPONSIVENESS – PASS/FAIL CRITERIA**

In Stage 1 of the evaluation process, the JSD Buyer will review all proposals received by the proposal due date and time. Electronic and hard-copy submissions will be opened within two (2) business days following the proposal deadline.

Proposals that are late; fail to include both required electronic and hard-copy submissions; do not conform to the required format or submission requirements of this RFP; fail to include required documents or information necessary to determine responsiveness; or fail to meet the Mandatory Minimum Requirements may be deemed nonresponsive.

Proposals deemed nonresponsive will not advance to Stage 2: Technical Proposal Evaluation and will not be eligible to receive an award under this RFP.

B. **STAGE 2: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION – SCORED CRITERIA, 600 POINTS POSSIBLE**

Proposals determined to be responsive in Stage 1 will advance to **Stage 2: Technical Proposal Evaluation**.

An evaluation committee appointed by JSD will review and score each responsive proposal based on the Offeror's responses to the Technical Proposal Evaluation Questions Matrix provided under Tab H: Detailed Technical Proposal Response (Scored Criteria). The matrix is

organized into Sections A through D and includes Questions A1–A8, B1–B7, C1–C5, and D1–D3.

Proposals will be scored in accordance with the evaluation criteria and scoring rubric established in this RFP. **The average of the evaluation committee members' Technical Proposal scores will constitute the final Technical Proposal score for each proposal.**

The Technical Proposal will be evaluated using the following categories and point values:

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible
A. Assessment Solution, Educational Approach, and Technical Quality	220
B. Ellevation Integration, Data Interoperability, Reporting, and Security	180
C. Implementation, Training, Support, and Long-Term Service	150
D. Relevant Experience, Past Performance, and Organizational Capacity	50

B.1 STAGE 2 SCORING METHODOLOGY

Each Technical Proposal Evaluation Question will be scored based on the overall quality of the Offeror's response, including the extent to which the response:

- clearly and completely addresses all required elements identified in the evaluation question;
- provides a relevant, specific, credible, and sufficiently detailed response; and
- demonstrates the Offeror's ability to meet the requirement described in the evaluation question.

Each response will be scored using the scoring rubric below. The score assigned to each response will be applied proportionally to the maximum points available for that evaluation question.

B.2 STAGE 2 SCORING RUBRIC

Scores will be assigned using the following 0–5 scale:

5 – Excellent

The response fully addresses all required elements identified in the evaluation question and provides a thorough, specific, credible, and well-supported approach that demonstrates an exceptional ability to meet or exceed the requirement. The response contains no material weaknesses.

4 – Good

The response addresses all required elements identified in the evaluation question and provides a clear, credible, and well-developed approach that demonstrates a strong ability to meet the requirement. The response contains only minor gaps or weaknesses.

3 – Satisfactory

The response addresses most required elements identified in the evaluation question and provides an acceptable approach that demonstrates an adequate ability to meet the requirement. Some areas may lack detail, specificity, clarity, or support.

2 – Unsatisfactory

The response addresses some required elements identified in the evaluation question but provides an incomplete, weak, or insufficiently supported approach. The response demonstrates limited ability to meet the requirement and contains noticeable gaps or weaknesses.

1 – Poor

The response minimally addresses the required elements identified in the evaluation question and provides little evidence of an adequate approach or ability to meet the requirement. Significant gaps or weaknesses are present.

0 – Fail

The response does not address the required elements identified in the evaluation question or does not demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement.

B.3 MINIMUM TECHNICAL SCORE REQUIREMENT

To remain eligible for further consideration, an Offeror must achieve a minimum **Stage 2 Technical Proposal score of 80%, or 480 points out of 600 possible points.**

Offerors that do not achieve the minimum technical score will not advance to the next stage of the evaluation process and will not be eligible to receive an award under this RFP.

Offerors that meet or exceed the minimum technical score will advance to Stage 3: Virtual Product Demonstration.

C. STAGE 3: VIRTUAL PRODUCT DEMONSTRATION – SCORED CRITERIA, 100 POINTS POSSIBLE

Offerors that meet or exceed the Minimum Technical Score Requirement will advance to **Stage 3: Virtual Product Demonstration.**

The purpose of the Virtual Product Demonstration is to provide the evaluation committee with an opportunity to further evaluate the proposed Solution and to clarify, validate, or further examine areas identified during the Technical Proposal evaluation.

The Virtual Product Demonstration may address areas directly related to the Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria established in this RFP, including functionality and user experience; assessment administration and reporting; data interoperability and District-level administration; implementation and support; and other relevant areas identified during JSD's review of the Technical Proposals.

Following completion of the Technical Proposal evaluation, JSD will provide all participating Offerors with the Virtual Product Demonstration instructions, including the specific time, evaluation questions or demonstration requirements, and the maximum points assigned to each question or requirement. All participating Offerors will receive the same questions, requirements, and scoring structure prior to the Virtual Product Demonstration. The maximum total Product Demonstration score is **100 points**.

Key personnel expected to be responsible for implementation, integration, account management, or ongoing support should participate in the Virtual Product Demonstration.

Each evaluation committee member will independently score the Virtual Product Demonstration based on the evaluation questions or demonstration requirements provided to participating Offerors. The average of the evaluation committee members' Product Demonstration scores will constitute the final Product Demonstration score for each proposal.

All Offerors that complete Stage 3 will advance to Stage 4: Cost Proposal Evaluation.

JSD may establish reasonable time limits, demonstration procedures, scenarios, structured questions, or other requirements necessary to ensure a fair and consistent evaluation process for all participating Offerors.

D. STAGE 4: COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION – SCORED CRITERIA, 300 POINTS POSSIBLE

Only Offerors that meet or exceed the Minimum Technical Score Requirement in Stage 2 and complete Stage 3: Virtual Product Demonstration will advance to **Stage 4: Cost Proposal Evaluation**.

Cost Proposals will be evaluated independently from the Technical Proposal and Virtual Product Demonstration. The Cost Proposal is worth **300 points**, representing thirty percent (30%) of the maximum total evaluation score.

Offerors must complete and submit the required **Cost Proposal Form (Attachment C)**.

Cost Proposal Forms that are incomplete, altered from the required format, contain conditions or qualifications not requested by JSD, fail to include required pricing

information, or otherwise fail to comply with the Cost Proposal Form instructions may be deemed nonresponsive.

A Cost Proposal deemed nonresponsive will not be considered further, and the Offeror will not be eligible to receive an award under this RFP.

2. EVALUATED COST

For evaluation purposes, JSD will calculate each Offeror's **5-Year All-Inclusive Total Evaluated Cost** using the pricing submitted on the Cost Proposal Form (Attachment C).

Offerors must itemize all costs for each contract year and provide tiered per-student pricing for Years 1 through 5.

For evaluation purposes, JSD will use an enrollment of **4,130 students for each contract year** and apply the pricing submitted for the **3,001–5,000 student enrollment tier**, plus any other required costs identified for that year.

JSD will add the evaluated costs for Years 1 through 5 to determine the **5-Year All-Inclusive Total Evaluated Cost** used for cost scoring.

The enrollment figure used for evaluation does not guarantee actual enrollment. Actual charges for each contract year will be based on JSD's actual student enrollment and the applicable pricing tier for that contract year.

Any required cost not separately identified in the Cost Proposal Form will be considered included in the submitted pricing and may not be charged separately to JSD.

JSD may review Cost Proposal Forms for completeness and may request clarification of submitted pricing as permitted by applicable procurement law.

3. COST SCORING FORMULA

Cost scores will be calculated using the following formula:

Cost Score = 300 × (Lowest Responsive 5-Year All-Inclusive Total Evaluated Cost ÷ Offeror's 5-Year All-Inclusive Total Evaluated Cost)

The Offeror with the lowest responsive **5-Year All-Inclusive Total Evaluated Cost** will receive the full **300 points** available for cost.

All other Offerors will receive a proportional cost score based on the relationship between their **5-Year All-Inclusive Total Evaluated Cost** and the lowest responsive **5-Year All-Inclusive Total Evaluated Cost**.

4. AWARD

JSD intends to make a single award for the English Language Proficiency Assessment Solution for Multilingual Learners described in this RFP.

Award may be made to the responsive and responsible Offeror whose proposal is determined to provide the best value and be most advantageous to JSD based on the evaluation criteria and cost factors identified in this RFP. The total combined evaluation score, including the Technical Proposal score, Product Demonstration score, and Cost Proposal score, will serve as the primary basis for JSD's award determination.

JSD will issue a **Public Notice of Intent to Award** through U3P Bonfire identifying the selected Offeror. The Public Notice of Intent to Award does not constitute a contract and does not authorize the selected Offeror to begin implementation, provide the Solution, or incur costs on behalf of JSD.

Any award resulting from this RFP is contingent upon final approval by the JSD Board of Education, anticipated to occur on **October 27, 2026**.

Following Board approval and completion of any required contract negotiations, JSD and the awarded Offeror will execute **JSD's contract**, and JSD will issue a purchase order for accounting and payment purposes.

The awarded Offeror may not begin implementation, provide the Solution or related services, or incur costs on behalf of JSD until JSD's contract has been fully executed and the JSD purchase order has been issued.

JSD reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, in whole or in part, or to cancel this solicitation when determined to be in JSD's best interest, in accordance with applicable procurement law.

Award under this RFP does not obligate JSD to purchase any optional, additional, or supplemental products or services unless expressly authorized by JSD in writing.

5. DEBRIEFINGS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

The Utah Procurement Code and applicable Utah Administrative Code do not require JSD to conduct written or verbal debriefings following an RFP award. JSD does not require individual evaluators to prepare written narrative comments supporting each score assigned.

JSD will provide the final evaluation score matrix with the Public Notice of Intent to Award. The matrix will include, as applicable, the final Technical Proposal score, final Product Demonstration score, Cost Proposal score, total combined evaluation score, and final ranking.

The final Technical Proposal score and final Product Demonstration score will each be based on the average of the evaluation committee members' scores.

JSD will also provide an explanation of how the recommended proposal provides best value to JSD.

JSD will not provide additional evaluator commentary, individual evaluator notes or working documents, proposal-development feedback, or other debriefing information beyond the evaluation and award information provided with the Public Notice of Intent to Award.

[The end.]