Request for Proposals No. 2023-13 Addendum 01 – Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the question and answer period of RFP No. 2023-13, issued March 10, 2023.

All amendments, addenda, and notifications related to this procurement will be posted on the OSPI website (if this was an open procurement) and on the Washington Electronic Business Solution (WEBS) website. Additional questions concerning this procurement must be submitted to contracts@K12.wa.us. Communication directed to other parties will be considered unofficial and non-binding on OSPI, and may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

1. **Question:** Does OSPI have any more information on the scope of the learning objectives they wish the learning modules to achieve?
    Answer: The learning objectives will be linked to the content items indicated in section 2.g of the Scope of Work of the RFP. Identifying and articulating the objectives is within the scope of work to be collaboratively determined between OSPI and the Contractor, as indicated in Scope of Work, 1. During the establishment of a shared understanding of the product, a realistic yet rigorous set of learning objectives would be identified. It is anticipated that learning objectives would be described in terms of what students would be expected to be able to do, how such ability might be measured, and described within a framework such as contemporary revisions of Bloom's original taxonomy.

2. **Question:** How has OSPI determined the eight week timeline for the scope they have laid out?
    Answer: The eight-week timeline was a result of the date the RFP was released and funding for the modules being tied to appropriations for fiscal year 2023, which ends June 30, 2023.

3. **Question:** Have the reports published by the workgroups in October 2020 and December 2021 referenced by the RFP on page 6 been made available to the public?
    Answer: The reports continue to be publicly available through the OSPI website on the Language Access Workgroup page, under 2021 Publications and 2020 Publications.

4. **Question:** The reports make reference to a Technical Assistance Program and the development of training modules for interpreters, is there any more information available about these recommendations?
    Answer: The reports referenced in Question #3 include the recommendations for the technical assistance program, the training modules, as well as the other

recommendations issued by the Language Access Workgroup. These recommendations are all related to language access.

5. **Question:** How is the evaluation team selected? Are any outside consultants part of the evaluation team?
Answer: The evaluation team has been selected in accordance with OSPI policies and consists of staff who have knowledge of the language access efforts in Washington state through facilitating the Language Access Workgroup convened in 2019-20 and 2020, based on their knowledge of interpreting and pedagogy, or experience providing or administering language access services at the district level. No member of the team is an outside consultant.

6. **Question:** How does the district currently train interpreters and translators?
Answer: There is not a sole district. Instead, there are 310 Local Educational Agencies in Washington state, 295 of which are school districts. There is great variation in how districts meet their language access needs. Some do have capacity to provide training for employees to serve as interpreters; some look to hire interpreters with certification/authorization; some have employees attend interpreter trainings that are made available.

7. **Question:** How many interpreters is the district looking to train per year?
Answer: As indicated in the response to Question 6, there is not one sole district in question. Districts may or may not seek to train interpreters directly. Because of the differences in enrollment and parent/guardian language access needs, some districts may meet these needs solely with outside resources. Therefore, it is indeterminate how many persons might engage with the training modules or engage in other training opportunities.

8. **Question:** Is the district open to language proficiency assessment of bilingual employees prior to training as a baseline evaluation or for selection onto the training program?
Answer: There is no training program per se. No qualifying requirements to take these training modules have yet been established, including language proficiency.

9. **Question:** How many interpreters does the district employ per year, semester or month?
Answer: There is no data currently available at the state level for the number of interpreters directly employed by districts.

10. **Question:** What are the top 3-5 languages needed?
Answer: The three language other than English most used in the state are Spanish, Vietnamese, and Russian, as indicated by common data measures.

11. **Question:** What percentage of translation and interpretation work do these languages represent?
Answer: There is no data available to indicate what percentages of translation/interpretation work correspond to these three languages. However, of the estimated statewide population of approximately 7.6 million, the percentages of persons with limited English proficiency for Spanish, Vietnamese, and Russian are approximately 6%, .4%, and .3%, respectively.

12. **Question:** How many languages does the district has needed in total, even if sone have been used on a limited number of occasions?
Answer: There is a very wide range in the number of languages, including those of limited diffusion, across the state's districts. Some larger districts have over 100 different reported languages used by students or families. Some of those languages are reported to be used by a relatively small number of persons.

13. **Question:** How does the district currently provide language services? Does the district contract language services?
Answer: Districts meet their language access needs in various ways. Many districts do contract for language services. Most do so through private language agencies, though some also, to varying degrees, enter into direct agreements with independent or freelance interpreters and translators. Other means that districts use, to varying extents are: "in language" services, namely bilingual staff who communicate directly with families requiring language assistance; direct employees working as interpreters and/or translators.

No questions or responses included in this document require any changes to the solicitation document; this document stands alone.