

**Division of Finance Management  
 Department of Procurement  
 MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
 45 W. Gude Drive, Suite 3100  
 Rockville, Maryland 20850**

April 29, 2026

**NOTICE TO OFFERORS**

**The following are questions and answers regarding  
 RFQ No. 7232.2, Assistive Technology Reading and Writing Tool**

| No. | Question   | Answer   |
|-----|--|--|
| 1.  | <b>Section 3.1, Additional requirements — reading controls.</b> The RFP requests <i>"Ability to customize reading controls, including the ability to adjust voice, speed, pitch, and accent."</i> Mote offers wide ranging voice and speed controls, with pitch adjusting for consistency when speed is changed. Is <b>"pitch"</b> adjustment (e.g. higher / lower pitch) explicitly requested as an option for learners?  | Pitch is not required explicitly.                    |
| 2.  | <b>Section 3.3(d)(v), Customizable Dashboards.</b> The RFP calls for <i>"customizable dashboards that visualize student and class performance against specific MCCRS learning objectives."</i> Our platform is primarily an assistive accommodations tool rather than a content or assessment platform. Could you clarify the expected performance data source — for example, are respondents expected to ingest student performance data from MCPS's existing assessment systems, or to independently generate a measure of student mastery?  | Section 3.3.(d)(v) is hereby removed                 |
| 3.  | <b>Section 3.3(d)(vii), Assessment Reporting.</b> The RFP asks for <i>"detailed reporting on formative and summative assessments, including question analysis, identification of specific skill gaps, and mastery tracking of individual standards."</i> Could you clarify whether this requirement applies to tools that deliver assessments, or whether an assistive technology tool that supports students <i>during</i> assessment (e.g. text-to-speech, dictation) is also expected to produce assessment-level analytics? If the latter, clarification of scope and source would be helpful. | Section 3.3(d)(vii) is hereby removed                |
| 4.  | <b>Section 3.3(h)(iii) and 3.3(h)(iv), LTI integration and Gradebook Sync.</b> The RFP requires <i>"LMS Gradebook Sync: Capability to synchronize assessment scores and progress data seamlessly"</i>  | Section 3.3(h)(iii) and 3.3(h)(iv) is hereby removed |

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
|     | <p><i>with the district's primary Learning Management System (LMS) gradebook using LTI 1.3 or higher standards." Assistive technology tools typically do not generate graded output. Could you clarify what "scores" are expected from an AT tool in this context, or whether this requirement is intended to apply to respondents in a different category?</i></p>   |   |
| 5.  | <p><b>Section 3.3(h)(v)(1)(2)(3), Performance Matters Unify integration.</b> The RFP requires export of scores in Performance Matters Unify format, provision of PDF tests for Answer Key Only (AKO) testing, and test items in QTI 2.1 format with MathML. These requirements describe the capabilities of an assessment authoring and delivery platform. Could you clarify whether these integrations are expected from an assistive technology respondent, or whether they are intended for a different solution category? We note separately that our tool currently operates <i>inside</i> Performance Matters OLA as a supporting accessibility layer for students, and we would welcome guidance on how that capability should be represented in our response.</p> | Section 3.3(h)(v)(1)(2)(3) is removed   |
| 6.  | <p><b>Section 3.3(f)(v), Browser compatibility.</b> The RFP requires <i>"complete compatibility with Chrome as well as other common browsers (i.e., Edge, Safari) using only default installation settings."</i> Given that MCPS is a Chromebook-led district and Safari is not available on ChromeOS, could you confirm whether Safari compatibility is a strict requirement, or whether it applies only to specific administrative or staff use cases outside of student-facing accommodations?</p>   | Safari compatibility is not a strict requirement.   |
| 7.  | <p>What is the integration expectation with Performance Matters Testing platform?</p>   | We expect students to be able to use text to speech, speech to text, and word prediction in open text responses for district-created assessments in Performance Matters.      |
| 8.  | <p>What additional languages are preferred for the Dictionary and Picture Dictionary?</p>   | Preferred languages are: English, Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, French, Vietnamese, Korean, Amharic, and Portuguese.   |
| 9.  | <p>What additional languages are required for Word Prediction?</p>  | Highly preferred languages are Spanish, French, and Mandarin Chinese. Other desired languages include Italian, Arabic, Japanese, Vietnamese, Korean, Amharic, and Portuguese. |
| 10. | <p>What scoring system are you using to assess vendor RFP submissions? Can you share your scoring rubric?</p>   | See the scoring numbers in the Erratum No. 1  |

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 11. | <b>Assessment Mode:</b> Does feature control need to be at the individual, class or domain level? i.e. is it necessary to be able to disable different tools for different student?                         | At a minimum, feature control should be able to be set at the individual level to ensure test integrity at the time of an assessment without disrupting access to the tools for other students who are not taking the assessment. |
| 12. | <b>Assessment Mode:</b> Do teachers need the ability to set feature controls for a 'class' i.e. should they be able to manage a group of students at once?  | This is highly preferred.   |
| 13. | <b>Assessment Mode:</b> Which users should have access to enable 'assessment mode'?   | At a minimum, the teacher.  |
| 14. | <b>Assessment Mode:</b> Besides feature control, are any other controls required to meet assessment mode expectations?  | No.   |
| 15. | <b>Student Usage Data:</b> Would it be acceptable to email the daily, weekly and monthly data weekly instead of providing a report/dashboard?   | A dashboard is preferred. Data must be in a format that can be sorted, and filtered, such as a spreadsheet. We require the ability to compare usage over time, so separate weekly reports would not suffice.                      |
| 16. | <b>Tools to support vocabulary study:</b> Are there any requirements on how vocabulary lists would be accessed by users?  | No.   |
| 17. | <b>Translations with teacher and student level control:</b> Can you clarify what that the expectation is here? We are interpreting this as Teachers are able to disable translation for individual students | That is accurate.   |
| 18. | What level of post-implementation support is expected: hypercare only, ongoing support, managed services? Can you provide more details on the budget constraints or funding availability?                   | We require a named contact person to support us on a regular basis as well as a named technical contact we can reach out to when issues (both technical and operational) arise.   |
| 19. | What are the anticipated changes in project scope or priorities?  | No changes are anticipated.   |
| 20. | Can you detail any previous challenges encountered in similar projects?   | We do not provide this information  |
| 21. | What specific versions are currently deployed: Canvas LMS, Google Workspace for Education, and Performance Matters?   | All are maintained at the most recent stable versions.  |
| 22. | Are there any additional/optional features you would desire?  | Please refer to the “additional features preferred” heading in section 3.1.   |
| 23. | What were the challenges with the previous solutions?   | See question #20  |
| 24. | Is there an incumbent? How much was their contract worth?   | Read&Write for Google by Everway.   |
| 25. | Is the incumbent allowed to bid on the contract?  | Yes.  |
| 26. | Do commercial or government references carry different significance?  | No.   |

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 27. | Have you worked with any vendor to do market research/put together this RFP?   | No.  |
| 28. | Is there any solution that the state preferences?  | No.  |
| 29. | Upon Award-decision what kind of feedback can bidders expect to get on proposal submissions?   | Prior to award a pre-award notification will be provided to all respondents to the solicitation.   |
| 30. | As an out of state vendor are we able to request an Open Records Request upon award decision?  | See Maryland Public Information Act (MPIA) requirements.   |
| 31. | What is the required go-live date for the 2026-2027 school year, and are there hard implementation deadlines tied to the academic calendar?  | Go live date is the start of the academic school year, which is August 17. MCPS will not consider a tool that is not fully functional with text to speech, speech to text, and word prediction at the time of selection.   |
| 32. | Is go-live expected to be district-wide immediately (all 30,000+ users), or phased by school/grade level?  | All 30,000+ users immediately.   |
| 33. | What is the anticipated breakdown of the 30,000+ licenses: students vs. teachers vs. staff/administrators?   | 30,000 represents the number of student users. Staff would be expected to be able to access and manage the tools without needing an additional license.  |
| 34. | Should pricing assume all licenses deployed at go-live, or is there a phased rollout plan?   | All licenses deployed at once.   |
| 35. | What identity provider is used for SSO (Google, Azure AD, Clever, other)?  | MCPS uses Google and Clever.   |
| 36. | Can MCPS provide specific details on "assessment mode" requirements: which features must be disabled, and how do teachers control this (per-student, per-assignment, platform-wide)?           | Preferred: Assessment mode would provide individual controls for text to speech, speech to text and word prediction while restricting all other features (picture dictionary, translation, etc.)<br>See also response #11. |
| 37. | Of the 162 languages spoken, which specific languages must be supported for core features (Text-to-Speech, Speech-to-Text, Word Prediction) - or is there a priority tier?                     | See answer #9.   |
| 38. | Can MCPS rank the "preferred" features (Section 3.1) by priority, and clarify if absence of any would disqualify a proposal?   | Absence of the first five features under 3.1 would disqualify a proposal.  |
| 39. | How many professional services/implementation hours must be included in base subscription pricing?   | It depends on the functionality of the product.  |
| 40. | Training expectations: How many staff need training (all 25,000 employees or specific roles), preferred timing (summer 2026 vs. school year), and format (remote, on-site, train-the-trainer)? | Flexible training formats are preferred with options for self-paced, live online, and always available resources. All staff should have the option to participate.   |
| 41. | Where must student data be stored (US-based servers required, specific regions, cloud vs. on-premises options), and are there restrictions on AI features processing student data?             | Vendors must disclose the location of servers storing student data. All storage and use of student data must comply with the district's acceptable use, data privacy,  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | and academic integrity policies. See <a href="https://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/data-privacy-security/safeguards/">https://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/data-privacy-security/safeguards/</a> In addition, vendors should not engage in sale of sensitive data, targeted advertising or unnecessary data collection. |
|--|--|---|

Saudy Espinal, Buyer II  
Department of Procurement

Please indicate your receipt of this notice by signing below and returning with your proposal or under a separate cover.

Accepted: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name and Title

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_