

Request for Proposals No. 2022-06

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. 2022-06, issued June 22, 2021.

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.

- Question:** Can this funding be used to place tanks in schools that are not on the list, if it means a contractor could equitably serve the entire district? For example, several of the districts we are looking at have about 2/3- 3/4 of their elementary schools on the list.

Answer: No. The proviso specifically states that “Funding may only be used for new programs located in elementary schools that are eligible for high-poverty allocations from the learning assistance program.” So that means we can only serve schools on the list.
- Question:** For scoring purposes, what is the scoring weight of the plan and curriculum as compared to the value of the number of schools/classes that the proposed contract will serve?

Answer: They have similar weight as we wouldn’t want to serve many schools/classes with a poor plan and curriculum, neither would we want to serve only a few schools/classrooms with a good plan and curriculum.
- Question:** Are you looking for multiple district involvement?

Answer: Yes, serving multiple districts provides for more equitable access.
- Question:** Is there a target number of classes/schools you are looking to have involved in the program?

Answer: There is not a specific target number, but we would like as many as possible to be served.
- Question:** In the RFP is the word “plan” synonymous with a curriculum unit or grade level unit of study that would become property of OSPI?



Answer: Developing a curriculum unit of study is not the purpose of the contract as those currently providing these services likely have curriculum already developed, and there may also be appropriate Open Educational Resources (OERs) that might be leveraged. However, if a new curriculum is developed specifically for this contract, it would become the property of OSPI per the Copyright Provision term in the General Terms and Conditions.

6. **Question:** Are you looking for something like a curriculum unit of study to be published?

Answer: No.

7. **Question:** Should the proposal be written for one or two years? For example, should we explain how we would develop and implement over the course of two years, with the assumption the funding continues for both years?

Answer: The initial term of the contract is one year, so proposals should be written for one year.

8. **Question:** If the contract proposes to serve classes across a number of districts, would that result in a higher score than serving the same number of classes in a single district?

Answer: Yes, serving multiple districts provides for more equitable access.

9. **Question:** Per the tank and equipment called for in the RFP and section 43 of the contract pertaining to assets does OSPI retain ownership of the tanks and equipment? Will they be collected and returned to OSPI at the conclusion of the program? If so, this would be a barrier to the long-term continuation of the program as schools would lose their supplies at the end of the contract.

Answer: The tanks and equipment should remain with the participating schools. The provision in the General Terms and Conditions says "Except as otherwise provided for in the Contract," so during the negotiation phase, we will alter the resulting contract to say that the tanks will remain with the participating schools and are not required to be surrendered to OSPI.

10. **Question:** Can funds from this contract be used to pay for student transportation from their schools to salmon release sites?

Answer: We prefer funding on student transportation be limited due to its expense, which would create a greater limit on the number of classes/schools that could be served.

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