



ADDENDUM NUMBER 1

Date Issued: February 18, 2026

PROJECT: RFP Customized Benchmark Assessment Program for Kingsport City Schools

This Addendum answers all questions submitted to Procurement.

1. The RFP requires alignment to the rigor of Tennessee Academic Standards. Given the rise of AI-generated item banks in the market, will the District require vendors to provide proof that all assessment items have been vetted by human content specialists and psychometricians, rather than solely generated by AI?
That will not be required.
2. The RFP states that the platform must contain item banks that are “continually reviewed and refreshed.” Can the District confirm if vendors will be required to provide an audit or report to prove that items are updated annually and not static/recycled from previous years?
The district would request an item bank report that is segmented by grade and subject counts on an annual basis. The district would not require segmentation by static/recycled versus new items.
3. In the Scope of Work, Item g requires reporting that provides “predictability values aligned with the corresponding TCAP assessment.” Will the District prioritize vendors who can validate these predictability values with longitudinal studies (multiple years and states) and large sample sizes (100,000+ students), or is a single-year validity study considered sufficient?
We want to have enough data to ensure alignment and predictability.
4. In alignment with the District's goal of “Exemplary Student Learning,” will the District award preference to vendors who can provide ESSA Level III (Promising Evidence) or higher demonstrating that usage of the platform is statistically linked to improved student achievement?
The most qualified vendor will be awarded based on the topics and criteria listed under “Criteria Used to Determine Winning Proposal” in the RFP pages 14 and 15.
5. The Adaptability & Accessibility criteria mentions compatibility with Canvas Learning Management System. Does the District define “compatibility” as a simple LTI link, or is there a preference for a deep, native integration where assessment data passes back to the Canvas Gradebook automatically without manual CSV exports or teacher data entry?
We would prefer an LTI link. Otherwise, a deep, native integration is sufficient.
6. The RFP mentions the solution should “ensure accurate alignment... and reduce instructional and administrative workload.” To minimize disruption, is it the District's preference that the selected vendor be able to utilize existing API setups with ClassLink and Canvas immediately upon contract renewal, rather than requiring new configurations?
It is the District's preference that the selected vendor be able to utilize existing API setups with ClassLink and Canvas immediately upon contract renewal.
7. The RFP mentions benchmarks will be created by the vendor with specific percentages of recycled items. Is it the District's intent to rely solely on the vendor for test construction, or is there a strategic goal to use this

platform to build internal capacity for teachers to create and share their own common formative assessments (CFAs) as part of the PLC process mentioned in the District's core values?

The vendor would be solely responsible for constructing the benchmarks. Teachers can create their own CFAs. In addition to the benchmarks, the district would prefer the ability for teachers to have the option to share CFAs during the PLC process.

8. What is the district's estimated annual budget for this project?

We do not have a budget estimate for this project at this time.

9. If new Tennessee Academic Standards are adopted at the state-level, and we can meet those new standards with an existing item bank, will that satisfy the item bank requirement that the platform must contain item bank(s) that are continually reviewed and refreshed?

The item banks need to be constantly reviewed and updated to reflect the most common version of the state standards. It is acceptable to use previous items that align with the new standards.

10. What is the anticipated contract start date?

July 1, 2026

11. Section B, page 3-4, says "The City of Kingsport, its officers, agents and employees shall be held harmless from liability from any claims, damages and actions of any nature arising from the use of any service and/or materials furnished by the Proposer, provided that such liability is not attributable to negligence on the part of the using agency of failure of the using agency to use the materials in the manner outlined by the Proposer in descriptive literature or specifications submitted with the Proposal. The City will not indemnify the successful Proposer." We presume "negligence on the part of the using agency of failure of the using agency to" is meant to read "negligence on the part of the using agency or failure of the using agency to". Is this correct?

Yes

12. Section F, page 4, says "Malpractice Insurance is required." Given the nature of the work to be performed under this RFP, can this requirement be eliminated?

Malpractice Insurance should be amended to state Technology Errors & Omissions. The limits as stated remain unchanged.

13. Although there is no provision in the RFP for delays in performance as a result of a force majeure event (events beyond the contractor's reasonable control including acts of God; acts or omissions of governmental authorities or the other party or any third party; strikes, lockouts or other industrial disturbances; acts of public enemies; wars; blockades; riots; civil disturbances; epidemics; floods; hurricanes; tornadoes; and any other similar acts, events, or omissions), does Kingsport City Schools acknowledge that such delays in performance would not constitute a breach of the contract?

Any delay because of a force majeure event would not constitute a breach of contract.

14. We presume that Bidder will not be held responsible for delays in performance obligations that are caused by errors in district or third-party systems?

Generally, no, provided the Bidder did not cause or contribute to the failure.

15. We presume Kingsport City Schools does not intend to claim ownership of Bidder's pre-existing Intellectual Property, including items, software, other computer programs, or derivatives thereof. Is this correct?

Correct.

16. We presume that the successful bidder will be allowed to negotiate reciprocal termination rights upon award. Is this correct?

Correct.

17. The term "Owner" is used in pages 11-15 of the RFP but is not defined. We presume this is meant to refer to Kingsport City Schools?

Yes, the term "Owner" refers to the City of Kingsport for its Kingsport City Schools.

End of Addendum Number 1