



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

July 14, 2025

Level Data
6850 Stadium Drive
Kalamazoo, MI 49009

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 202407142,
Educator Credentialing System

Dear Gloria McMahon:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Education for Educator Credentialing System. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Level Data


The bidder listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

8798326A52BB412...

Michael T. Perry, Director
Office of Higher Education & Educator Support Services
Maine Department of Education
Michael.T.Perry@maine.gov

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: RFP# 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System
BIDDER: Level Data (Sole Bidder)
DATE: 4/16/2025

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Education
Name of RFP Coordinator: Michael Perry
Names of Evaluators: Courtney Baehr, Kelsey Bragdon, Damian Donato, Chelsey Fortin-Trimble, Kimberly Hall, Erin Reinhard, Michael Perry

<u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>	<u>Pass</u>	<u>Fail</u>
Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)	X	
<u>Scoring Sections</u> (Edit sections below to match evaluation criteria within RFP)	<u>Points Available</u>	<u>Points Awarded</u>
Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience	30	N/A
Section III. Proposed Services	45	N/A
Section IV. Cost Proposal	25	N/A
<u>Total Points</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>N/A</u>

Please note: There was only one bidder that submitted a proposal to this RFP.

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: RFP# 202407142

RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System

BIDDER: Level Data (Sole Bidder)

DATE: 4/16/2025

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I
Preliminary Information**

Section I. Preliminary Information

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Passed
 - a. Appendix A and B are included and completed in full

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: RFP# 202407142

RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System

BIDDER: Level Data (Sole Bidder)

DATE: 4/16/2025

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

	<u>Points Availabl e</u>	<u>Points Awarde d</u>
Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience	30	N/A

Evaluation Team Comments:

I. Overview of the Organization

- Qualifications and Experience Form
 - i. 10 years of experience in multiple states
 - ii. Several business cases explaining what is being done with the states
 - iii. Illustrated can do what we asked but also included other modules or capabilities
 - iv. EPP interfacing, supply and demand information through GIS mapping
 - v. One vendor that can do many items
 - vi. Communications outlined on educator dashboard interesting
 - vii. Enforcing hiring compliance
 - viii. Wizards helping application process
 - ix. Are they FBI approved?
 - x. Would've like to see more detail on actual certification process
 1. General walk thru of workflow
 2. Skips basics of certifications
 3. Could be an issue with the RFP of how it was written
 4. Not enough detail on the baseline product
 5. Missing deep dive on certification process – promising features but need to see that the core is solid
 - xi. Focused on fixing other states, more data issues addressed than process
 - xii. Purchased a company that did certification, concerns of ability to execute
 - xiii. Would like to see demo
 1. We want to see what the baseline product looks like – actual tool
 2. Demo could clarify
 - xiv. Full schedule for implementation and goal points
 - xv. Modifiable off the shelf MOTS
- Project Examples
 - i. KY separate endorsement licenses
 1. How did they do this? Needed more of the How

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: RFP# 202407142

RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System

BIDDER: Level Data (Sole Bidder)

DATE: 4/16/2025

- ii. TN emphasized portal for EPPs, visibility into EPPs
 - iii. Mississippi
 - 1. EPP functionality
 - 2. Data reporting
 - 3. Analysis of the educator pipeline
 - iv. MA released a system but then didn't give much detail into the project
- II. Subcontractors
 - No subcontractors
 - TA question about referencing TierPoint as a subcontractor – what is their role?
- III. Organizational Chart
 - Was provided
 - Represents highest level skilled leadership and then additional folks that do work within the project
 - Would like to see more detail into additional staff rather than the core leadership
 - Not a ton of people to work on a customizable system
 - High level
- IV. Litigation
 - No reported litigation
- V. Financial Viability
 - Included assessment form Dun and Bradstreet
 - i. Low – moderate risk
- VI. Certificate of Insurances
 - Draft watermark on the COI

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: RFP# 202407142

RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System

BIDDER: Level Data (Sole Bidder)

DATE: 4/16/2025

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Proposed Services**

	<u>Points Availabl e</u>	<u>Points Awarde d</u>
Section III. Proposed Services	45	N/A

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Scope of Services

- a. Potential typo in the system availability 265 instead of 365
 - i. Is this a typo or is this real?
 - ii. An issue if real
- b. Emergency hotline if the system goes down?
- c. Didn't specifically say they use SSNs
 - i. Do they use them?
 - ii. Is necessary
 - iii. Matches fingerprints to SSN
- d. Can the system be accessed in other countries?
 - i. Would need Canada at minimum
 - ii. Doesn't sound like there is anything preventing, but not explained
- e. How do they prevent fraud when printing certificates?
 - i. Not explained in response
- f. What fingerprint contracting services do they work with now?
 - i. Want to ensure they are FBI approved to work with our system
- g. Clear in the RFP to not use the word licensing – used throughout the response
- h. Say they can do it but not detailed enough
- i. Communication tools
 - i. Within the system staff can communicate with applicants as tagged by the applications
 - 1. Internal communication within the system
 - ii. Notifications that staff can put into users dashboards
 - iii. Concerns about similarity to Teams/IM and team capacity
 - iv. Could be within the system only or externally
 - v. Could reply to comments to reopen
 - vi. Customizable
- j. Workflows and approvals
 - i. Customizable workflows for applications
 - ii. System admin can customize the endorsements to create state specific
- k. Allowed for bulk uploads from EPPs and SAUs
- l. Connection with EPPs and doing reviews through the system
- m. Having in one place nice

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: RFP# 202407142

RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System

BIDDER: Level Data (Sole Bidder)

DATE: 4/16/2025

- n. SAUs can report directly into this system
 - i. Could help eliminate back and forth in systems if streamlined
 - ii. Connection with NEO, NASDTEC, ETS, fingerprinting Identigo
- o. Limited proof and images for the team to review to understand what it would look like in a system
- p. Mention of tracking and professional development could be housed within this system
- q. Customizable searches and data filter that the user can produce on their end – enhanced functionality from current abilities
- r. We do not own the code, we own the data
- s. Asked for evidence, not much given, missing details requested from the RFP
- t. **Training plan outline**

2. Implementation – Work Plan

- a. Full schedule and internal and external
- b. Deliverable due dates
- c. Thorough and well detailed
- d. Video modules and sandbox environment written trainings
 - i. Would like to see them

3. System Requirements Form – Appendix D

- a. Just wrote yes with no explanations or elaborations
 - i. How?

4. Staffing Chart

- a. Need to define Your level data team and the chart submitted was similar to the beginning and narrative represents another 16 staff
- b. Unclear about those folks roles and responsibilities
- c. Complete staffing chart desired

5. Technical Assessment – Appendix E

- a. Met if bidder is considered, would need to provide Information Security Policies and LevelData SOC2 type 2 once completed
- b. Policies were cited
- c. Hosting center is certified – soc2 type 2
- d. SOC – standardized report that is third party auditor and attests to results to tests run in an environment
- e. Good responses but wanted more detail behind the responses
- f. Overall security posture is pretty good

6. Post Demo Notes

- a. First 45 mins sales pitch, last 15 mins demo
- b. Not looking for a pitch
- c. Numbers did not make sense
- d. Other states had less than 10k users,
- e. Not full state certification
- f. Our numbers of users are 500k other states around
- g. they did not show evaluations that included coursework
- h. reciprocity and epp approved program

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: RFP# 202407142

RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System

BIDDER: Level Data (Sole Bidder)

DATE: 4/16/2025

- i. tests not coursework and full evaluation
- j. evals are actually internal and not within the program
- k. course by course is main function needed for SOM
- l. the system wouldn't be able to read transcripts
- m. not used to creating a system where users are inputting coursework
- n. numbers of courses within a certain subject, do they know what the states are doing once the system is built?
- o. We asked directly and they did not show fully what was asked
- p. Still have unanswered questions
- q. We don't have enough information to determine if they can or cannot fully execute the task at hand
- r. Vague when asked about FBI approval, not a black and white yes or no
- s. They would know if they were FBI approved. Led us to question accuracy
- t. Frustrated with that response, the Team's experience with FBI audits were not in line with their response
- u. High cost but lots of Department maintenance after initial build
- v. Could customize the system
- w. Is the customization up front or not
- x. Framework for the Department to do have full ownership of those rules
- y. Sales pitch had details of data collected
- z. Did not focus on the certification process, it was showing the full products spread
- aa. Massachusetts, CT, VT – could we speak to them? They were comparative to Maine's services
- bb. Serve states that have their own approved programs or alternative routes
- cc. Geared towards those approved programs
- dd. Maine has less educators going through those approved programs – could be the disconnect on the number of users for other states

**STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

RFP #: RFP# 202407142

RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System

BIDDER: Level Data (Sole Bidder)

DATE: 4/16/2025

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV
Cost Proposal**

Lowest Submitted Cost Proposal	÷	Cost Proposal Being Scored	x	Score Weight	=	Score
N/A	÷	N/A	x	25 points	=	N/A

Evaluation Team Comments:

N/A Formula and only Bidder

STATE OF MAINE
GROUP CONSENSUS NOTES - TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

RFP #: 202407142

RFP TITLE: DOE EDUCATOR CREDENTIALING SYSTEM

BIDDER NAME: LevelData

DATE: 04/10/2025

EVALUATOR NAME: Ben Haschalk, Damian Donato, Wayne Harmon

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS/OIT

Consensus Evaluator Comments:

Overall Consensus

Met. If bidder is considered, bidder would need to provide Information Security Policies and LevelData SOC2 Type II (once completed).

Data Compliance		
Publicly available information	NIST 800-171	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Maine FOAA	Weak evidence. ‘..will comply and be compliant during period of contract..’
		Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
Confidential Personally Identifiable Information (PII)	Maine Breach Notification Law	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Weak evidence. Requirement not addressed.
	NIST 800-53: Rev5	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Privacy Act of 1974	Weak evidence. Requirement not addressed.
		Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	U.S. DHHS-OCSE	
		Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Weak evidence. Requirement not addressed.
Payment Card Information	Payment Card Industry Data Security	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak

STATE OF MAINE
GROUP CONSENSUS NOTES - TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

RFP #: 202407142

RFP TITLE: DOE EDUCATOR CREDENTIALING SYSTEM

BIDDER NAME: LevelData

DATE: 04/10/2025

EVALUATOR NAME: Ben Haschalk, Damian Donato, Wayne Harmon

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS/OIT

	Standard (PCI DSS) v 3.2	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Weak evidence. Compliance not addressed or explicitly stated. Policy cited but not provided, however that policy is only one portion of security controls to meet requirement.
	Nacha Operating Rules (ACH)	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak Weak evidence. Compliance not addressed or explicitly stated. Policy cited but not provided, however that policy is only one portion of security controls to meet requirement.
Student Education Data	Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act: FERPA	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Weak evidence. Lacking details of how requirement is met.
Personal Information From	Driver's Privacy Protection Act	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
		Weak evidence. ‘..will comply..will be compliant..’
MaineIT		
H1	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak	
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak	
	*TierPoint SOC2 Type II provided. - Dated report – for period of 2022-2023 - Only Security and Availability trust principles provided (this further enforces the need for confidentiality, integrity and privacy controls be in place by the bidder) - No exceptions	
H2	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak	
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak Adequate evidence. Backup Plan included within proposal. Outlines Business Continuity plan.	

STATE OF MAINE
GROUP CONSENSUS NOTES - TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

RFP #: 202407142

RFP TITLE: DOE EDUCATOR CREDENTIALING SYSTEM

BIDDER NAME: LevelData

DATE: 04/10/2025

EVALUATOR NAME: Ben Haschalk, Damian Donato, Wayne Harmon

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS/OIT

H3	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. ‘..will comply..will be compliant..’
A1	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Adequate evidence. Backup Plan included within proposal. Outlines Business Continuity plan.
A2	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking details to satisfy requirement.
A3	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
A4	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
Information Security Standards	
S1	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Bidder does not explicitly answer requirement (re:SSP).
S2	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
S3	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Compliance stated without an explicit statement regarding the requirement.

STATE OF MAINE
GROUP CONSENSUS NOTES - TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

RFP #: 202407142

RFP TITLE: DOE EDUCATOR CREDENTIALING SYSTEM

BIDDER NAME: LevelData

DATE: 04/10/2025

EVALUATOR NAME: Ben Haschalk, Damian Donato, Wayne Harmon

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS/OIT

S4	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	'No' response.
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Requirement not addressed.
S5	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	'No' response.
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Bidder states 'not a materials basis' and suggest as this is a SAAS solution, SBOM does not apply, which is not true.
Cloud Service Provider Reqs	
CSP1	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP2	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP3	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP4	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. WCAG is only one component of the policy.
CSP5	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. SOC report is sub-par regarding controls tested, the bidder is responsible for providing more evidence to support the policy requirement.
CSP6	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP7	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak

STATE OF MAINE
GROUP CONSENSUS NOTES - TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

RFP #: 202407142

RFP TITLE: DOE EDUCATOR CREDENTIALING SYSTEM

BIDDER NAME: LevelData

DATE: 04/10/2025

EVALUATOR NAME: Ben Haschalk, Damian Donato, Wayne Harmon

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS/OIT

	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP8	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP9	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP10	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP11	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP12	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP13	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
CSP14	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Blank response.
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
NIST Reqs	
N1	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak

STATE OF MAINE
GROUP CONSENSUS NOTES - TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

RFP #: 202407142

RFP TITLE: DOE EDUCATOR CREDENTIALING SYSTEM

BIDDER NAME: LevelData

DATE: 04/10/2025

EVALUATOR NAME: Ben Haschalk, Damian Donato, Wayne Harmon

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS/OIT

N2	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
N3	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
N4	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met. Auditing practices briefly touched on.
N5	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
N6	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
N7	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Weak evidence. ‘..the company must..’ it is unknown whether this is a charge to SOM or a reference to the bidder’s own policy.
N8	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	‘Company’ references are ambiguous though this does seem to be a portion of the bidder’s policy.
N9	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
	Quality of Evidence: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak
N10	Quality of Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Weak

STATE OF MAINE
GROUP CONSENSUS NOTES - TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

RFP #: 202407142

RFP TITLE: DOE EDUCATOR CREDENTIALING SYSTEM

BIDDER NAME: LevelData

DATE: 04/10/2025

EVALUATOR NAME: Ben Haschalk, Damian Donato, Wayne Harmon

EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS/OIT

	<i>Quality of Evidence:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
N11	<i>Quality of Response:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
	<i>Quality of Evidence:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
N12	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
	<i>Quality of Response:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
	<i>Quality of Evidence:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
N13	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
	<i>Quality of Response:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
	<i>Quality of Evidence:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
N14	Weak evidence. Lacking in detail how requirement is met.
	<i>Quality of Response:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
	<i>Quality of Evidence:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strong</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Weak</i>
	*Bidder is working on their own SOC2 Type II



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Courtney Baehr accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Signed by:

Courtney Baehr

7D6E70A8DB00494...

Signature

1/29/2025

Date



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Kelsey Bragdon accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Signed by:

Kelsey Bragdon

DE9267FA8E0F42B...

Signature

1/29/2025

Date



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Damian Donato accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Signed by:

Damian Donato

7748DEB424184B7...
Signature

1/30/2025

Date



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Chelsey Fortin-Trimble accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Signed by:

Chelsey Fortin-Trimble

347D8D2394F34C9...

Signature

5/6/2025

Date



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Kimberly Hall accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

DocuSigned by:

Kimberly Hall

215E5E0720A1470...

Signature

1/29/2025

Date



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Wayne Harmon accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

DocuSigned by:

Wayne Harmon

00015222957A102...

Signature

2/27/2025

Date



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Ben Haschalk accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Signed by:

Ben Haschalk

B14CDE596CB3447...

Signature

3/11/2025

Date



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Michael Perry accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

DocuSigned by:

0700320A52BD412...
Signature

1/28/2025

Date



**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Janet T. Mills
Governor**

**A. Pender Makin
Commissioner**

**AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202407142
RFP TITLE: Educator Credentialing System**

I, Erin Reinhard accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Education. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

DocuSigned by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Erin Reinhard".

0910A70E473D4D9...

Signature

1/29/2025

Date