

Request for Proposal No. 2022-20

Addendum 02 – Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the question and answer period of RFP No. 2022-20, issued October 25, 2021.

All amendments, addenda, and notifications related to this procurement will be posted on the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction ([OSPI website](#)), on behalf of the State Board of Education (SBE), 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 SBE, and may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

1. **Question:** When we host in-person events, who is responsible for:

- Participants travel: mileage, flying, hotel, meals outside of event
- Contractual obligations /Substitute teachers

Answer: We do not expect the Contractor to be responsible for participant mileage, airfare, hotel, meals outside the event, contractual obligations related to educator compensation, or substitute teachers.

2. **Question:** When we host virtual events, who is responsible for costs that might be incurred by participants?

Answer: It depends on the nature of the cost, and is something we would work out during contract negotiations. Generally, we expect the Contractor to pay all license, user, and access-related fees for software used for virtual events, but there may be exceptions in certain cases. For example, if a participant incurred long distance charges for participating in a Zoom meeting via a land line phone instead of participating online for free, we would not expect the Contractor to pay the phone charges.

3. **Question:** If we offer team events, can we stipulate the roles that must participate?

Answer: We have informed schools that core professional learning will be provided by the state. The Contractor selected under RFP 2022-20 will provide that core professional learning, and we think it is reasonable for the Contractor to stipulate roles for participation in team events offered by the Contractor.

4. **Question:** In the RFP for pilot sites, you list a series of expectations that the pilot sites follow within the MBLC community. Specifically, you require schools to participate “consistently (4-6 sessions per year) as a MBLC team in a PLC to build capacity and share out to others in the community. PLCs are leveled to be useful to your school.” Is

providing these opportunities a part of the expectations for the successful bidder, and if so, can you identify the language in the contract RFP where this is outlined.

Answer: We expect the successful bidder to provide these opportunities. RFP 2022-20 Section A.4.A.9.c indicates the professional learning opportunities provided by the successful bidder will provide implementation support, including "Opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning communities including CRSE practices." With this response, we are changing that language to read "At least 4 professional learning community sessions per year, to build capacity, including CRSE capacity, and share out to others in the MBLC community."

5. **Question:** In these same expectations, you require: "Sharing resources with others in the MBLC community via our digital resource sharing system." Does the WA State Board of Education have an existing digital sharing resource system that you expect the contractor to use? Or do you expect the contractor to create this system?

Answer: The State Board of Education anticipates developing such a system or using its existing website for the duration of the project. We do not expect the Contractor to create this system.

6. **Question:** Per SOW 2., 1., "Work collaboratively with the MBL Collaborative Director as well as other staff, as necessary, including staff from at least 3 state agencies. Includes attending any meetings and appointments; what is the frequency and duration of these meetings?" Are they expected to be onsite or virtual?

Answer: The frequency and duration of these meetings will be mutually determined during contract negotiations. Currently, we anticipate virtual participation at monthly 90-minute meetings, supplemented by up to 90 minutes per month of ad-hoc meetings.

7. **Question:** Per SOW 2., 2., "Cooperate with the project evaluator on evaluation-related activities, including reporting, participating in interviews with the project evaluator, and incorporate the project evaluator's formative assessment in planning the professional learning"; can you provide details on the interviews and your expectation?

Answer: Aurora Institute will interview representatives of the SBE and professional learning provider in the spring of each year of the evaluation, on a date to be mutually determined. Interview length will be about one hour. Interviews will take place in person if they can be scheduled during site visits. We plan for the interviews to include discussion of the following topics (which may change as the evaluation plan evolves): planning activities (first year only); progress facilitators, challenges and needs (all years); professional learning experiences (all years); enabling school, district, and state policies (all years); and state structures and support activities (all years).

Aurora will also observe quarterly professional learning gatherings of the MBLC statewide community once during the first year and twice during each of other years, either virtually or in-person. In addition, Aurora plans to select five schools for site

visits during the second and third years and would observe MBLC school team professional learning activities in person if they are scheduled during school visits, and virtually otherwise.

We expect the professional learning provider to provide an annual report to include elements specified by SBE, which may become a data source for addressing the evaluation questions.

We also expect that the professional learning provider's evolving plans will utilize relevant formative evaluation findings provided by the Aurora Institute.

8. **Question:** Per SOW 2., 5., Assist with planning, as well as, facilitate or present a mutually agreed on number of sessions at an online or in-person annual statewide event or conference each year (currently envisioned as a day-long event), how many participants do you anticipate, and what are their roles?
Answer: We currently estimate between 200-600 participants at each statewide event or conference. The number would likely be closer to 200 during fiscal year 2021-22 and closer to 600 during subsequent years. But we could get more than 600, depending on the extent to which schools encourage their entire educator staff to participate. Most people would participate as learners, but some may also serve as presenters or panelists.
9. **Question:** Per SOW 1., 1 "narrative description of professional learning objectives," are these the objectives for year 1, years 2 and 3, or all years?
Answer: All years.
10. **Question:** In the Technical Proposal [C.3.vi](#), "Outline a proposal for minimizing staff turnover and its impact on the Contractor's ability to carry out its work for this project," does the proposal pertain to minimizing SBE, district, and school staff turnover (or the Contractor)?
Answer: The proposal for minimizing staff turnover pertains to Contractor staffing only.
11. **Question:** What are the sections that may not exceed the page limits?
 - **Answer:** The page limit for the Letter of Submittal, excluding the signed Certifications and Assurances and Contractor Intake Form, is one (1) page.
 - The total page limit for the Work Plan¹ section of the Technical Proposal and the Management Proposal² added together is eighteen (18) pages.
 - Examples that comply with this page limit:

¹ RFP 2022-20 Sections C.3.ii and A.4.B.1 describe the Work Plan.

² RFP 2022-20 Section C.4 describes the management proposal

- 11-page Work Plan and 7-page Management proposal (18 total pages)
- 9-page Work Plan and 8-page Management proposal (17 total pages)
- Examples that do not comply with this page limit:
 - 11-page Work Plan and 8-page Management proposal (19 total pages)
 - 10-page Work Plan and 10-page Management proposal (20 total pages)
- The page limit for each resume is two (2) pages.

12. **Question:** Does there need to be a written response for the Project Approach/Methodology Section in addition to the recorded video?

Answer: No. Bidders should submit only a video link, without a written response.

13. **Question:** In relation to CRSE, is the current focus [this](#) framework overview from NYSED or the CCDEI standards that were developed from the CRSE?

Answer: We see the NYSED framework as a useful resource for Bidders to consider in developing their proposals but did not mean to imply that its overview is the “current focus” of the RFP. Alignment of professional learning with the [Professional Educator Standards Board’s CCDEI standards](#) will be required after the standards are adopted.

14. **Question:** Are the 3 foci (Culture & Purpose, Pedagogy, Structure) and the 10 distinguishing features of MBL that are defined within each vs. the 5 Design Principles the main focus of the project?

Answer: A summary of the main focus of the project, as described in the RFP, is to help schools implement MBL as defined in the RFP, in a Culturally-Responsive Sustaining manner.

15. **Question:** If the proposer focused on making the Washington State DOE One Pager a reality, would the project be considered a success?

Answer: We are assuming this is the “[One Pager](#)” you are referring to. Beginning to close opportunity gaps mentioned in the One Pager could be a sign of success. But confounding factors (influences outside of the project) would have to be taken into account in drawing any conclusions about the project’s impact. The project’s focus alone would not necessarily make the project a success.