



CITY OF MEMPHIS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

#71539

Police Promotional Testing and Assessment Services

Addendum # 3

Questions & Answers

Except to remove vendor names and addresses, questions are provided exactly as submitted.

#		Section	Question / Answer
1	Q	1	The opening paragraph of the RFP states that bidders are limited to “only vendors certified by the Uniform Certification Agency and approved by the City of Memphis as a Small Business Enterprise”. Two criteria for SBE certification per the ordinance cited in the paragraph are (a) that the business “is located in the city of Memphis” and (b) that “the principal owner maintains a residence in the Memphis MSA.” Is there a procedure available to seek a waiver from the SBE limitation that would permit our company to bid on this project?
1	A		Please refer to RFP# 71539 – Addendum 2
2	Q	2	For each of the ranks included in this RFP, when was the last promotional process conducted and what were the number of candidates who participated in the process?
2	A		The last promotional processes for all ranks were conducted from June through September 2020. The number of candidates who participated were: SGT – 582 out of 1034 eligible LT – 165 out of 225 eligible Major – 69
3	Q	2.3	Section 2.3 states that “Proposer shall have a principal(s), pertinent staff member(s), and/or subcontractor(s) who is a licensed Industrial/Organizational (I/O) psychologist.” We are based out of Washington State, where there are no such licensing requirements to practice I/O psychology. Would we need to obtain a license from State of Tennessee?
3	A		Please refer to RFP# 71539 – Addendum 1
4	Q	Page 61	Will the City make an exception to their insurance policy requirements regarding Cyber Liability (“Network Security and Privacy”)?
4	A		The selected vendor can submit a written request to waiver the cyber liability insurance and explain their reason for request. The City’s Law Division reviews all waiver requests. There may be some consideration given towards the minimum coverage amount, but vendors will still most likely be required to have some amount of cyber coverage.

5	Q		Is the City open to off-the-shelf written examinations for any rank?
5	A		Due to past litigation, the City has avoided using off-the-shelf written tests for promotional testing. Vendors proposing off-the-shelf tests would need to present a strong case in their proposal and address any potential adverse impact issues.
6	Q		Is the City willing to conduct development meetings for the promotional exams via webinar/phone conference?
6	A		The term “developmental meetings” is not well-defined in this question. The City is willing to conduct project planning meetings via webinar/phone conference. If developmental meetings refer to conducting job analyses, it is strongly suggested that the job analyses and ride alongs be conducted in-person.
7	Q		What was the prior award amount(s) for these or similar services? If the services in the RFP were paid separately, and not as a lump sum, how much did the City pay for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergeant I • Sergeant II • Lieutenant • Major
7	A		The prior contracted amounts for similar services were: SGT I - \$491,840 LT - \$472,160 Major - \$234,700 (SGT II rank did not exist)
8	Q		Who was the prior vendor for these or similar services?
8	A		Emergency Services Consulting International (ESCI)
9	Q		In the past, have any rank(s) included a written (multiple-choice) examination? If so, how many items/questions were included in each written examination. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergeant I • Sergeant II • Lieutenant • Major
9	A		The City does not consider this to be a relevant question. The selected vendor must determine what and how many test components to use based upon their job analysis, their test methodology, and their expertise in I/O psychology.

10	Q		<p>How many candidates participated in the previous written exam for the ranks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergeant I • Sergeant II • Lieutenant • Major
10	A		<p>SGT I - 573 LT - 165 (SGT II did not exist)</p>
11	Q	2.6.d	<p>The City has expressed a preference for administering each test component in one day. How many assessors were used in prior assessment center for each rank?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergeant I • Sergeant II • Lieutenant • Major
11	A		<p>No live assessors were used in prior assessment centers. Candidate performances were video/audio recorded and then scored. The selected vendor must determine how many assessors to use based upon their expertise in I/O psychology.</p>
12	Q		<p>How many exercises were used in the previous assessment center for each rank:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergeant I • Sergeant II • Lieutenant • Major
12	A		<p>The City does not consider this to be a relevant question. The selected vendor must determine what and how many test components to use based upon their job analysis, their test methodology, and their expertise in I/O psychology.</p>
13	Q		<p>What exercises did the previous assessment center consist of for each rank:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergeant I • Sergeant II • Lieutenant • Major

13	A		The City does not consider this to be a relevant question. The selected vendor must determine what and how many test components to use based upon their job analysis, their test methodology, and their expertise in I/O psychology.
14	Q		Over how many days was the previous assessment center conducted for each rank: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergeant I • Sergeant II • Lieutenant • Major
14	A		SGT I – 4 weeks of mandatory training provided 2 written exams (2 days) LT – 2 assessment centers (2 days) 2 written exams (2 days) Major – assessment center (1 day)
15	Q	3	Proposal Response' I do not see a specific proposal section for proposers to respond to how they will perform the scope of work. Can you please clarify which section this should be written in?
15	A		The project methodology/project management plan section was omitted in error. Please refer to the attached correction.



City of Memphis

Request for Proposal (RFP) #71539

For Police Promotional Testing and Assessment Services

ADDENDUM #3 – March 18, 2022

This addendum forms a part of the City of Memphis RFP #71539.

ITEM #1: The requirements outlined under the section titled “Proposal Response” (Section 3 on page 12) have been updated to include an additional section as follows:

3.4-A PROJECT METHODOLOGY/ PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN

In Section 4(a) of the Proposal response (immediately following the Executive Summary), Proposer should provide a detailed description of the services to be provided as set forth in this RFP. The description should include, but not be limited to, the discussion of the following:

- a. An introduction with an overview of Proposer’s understanding of the scope of work and services to be provided.
- b. The proposed services and the methodology / approach that will be used to accomplish the tasks identified in the Scope of Work section. Proposer shall discuss their job analysis methodology and how their team will analyze, develop, validate, administer, and score the test(s). Proposer shall include information about their proposed scoring methodology. The project management plan shall include the delineation of roles and responsibilities, a detail of team assignments, and project delivery approach.
- c. A statement regarding how the Proposer is prepared to respond promptly to unexpected issues, potential problems, or any changes in the scope of work.
- d. The methods Proposer will use to protect the confidentiality and integrity of the test and test materials (i.e. security measures).
- e. Any requirement or need for City-furnished personnel (i.e. proctors), materials, equipment, or facilities for each proposed test component/administration should be detailed in this section.

Proposer shall limit their response to this section to 7 pages or less.