

RFQQ No. 2020-35

Addendum 02 – Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the question and answer period of RFQQ No. 2020-35, issued April 2, 2020.

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:** Our company is on the current list of approved vendors, should we need to reapply for this RFQQ?

Answer: No.
- Question:** Is the OSPI Dyslexia Advisory Council only looking for Dyslexia screening tools, or are they also looking for resources to support students that have been identified?

Answer: This RFQQ is only for screening tools. The purchase of additional tools will be determined by the individual school districts.
- Question:** In Section A, item 6 (Period of Performance) and item 7 (Funding) indicate the following: *OSPI will publish a vetted list of academic screening tools for school districts to access.* Could you please clarify whether WA OSPI seeks academic screeners to assess literacy skill or dyslexia screeners (academic screeners to assess dyslexia specifically), or both?

Answer: OSPI is requesting proposals for academic screeners that highlight literacy skills. Proposals submitted that are dyslexia screeners/evaluations will not be considered. Add 4 skills.
- Question:** In Section C, under Vendor and Staff Qualification and Experiences, item (a) requires a description of how the consultant meets the consultant qualifications. The consultant qualifications include knowledge of foundational reading and rapid automatized naming for Washington State implementation. Could WA OSPI please clarify if rapid automatized naming (all four components) is a required feature for the academic assessments that assess literacy skills, for the dyslexia screener only, or for both?



Answer: No, it is not. A vendor can submit a proposal that attends to phonemic awareness, phonological awareness, and letter sound knowledge and still be considered by the Dyslexia Advisory Council.

Question: Could you please address the Consultant Qualification about rapid automatized naming? If we are submitting something that does not attend to rapid automatized naming, must the consultant meet that particular qualification?

Answer: No. As required by statute: phonemic awareness, phonological awareness, letter sound knowledge, and rapid automatized naming: letters, numbers, familiar objects, and colors. OSPI is seeking academic screeners focusing on the above skills and is **not** looking for a dyslexia diagnostic or formal assessment.

5. **Question:** So that bidders can provide the detailed data and alignments that are required by the RFQQ, can additional materials be appended to the proposal that are not counted as part of the page limit?

Answer: No, we need the proposals to be manageable for all types of readers. Those sections may not be reviewed.

6. **Question:** In the *Bias and Sensitivity* and *Capacity to Support Washington State School Districts* sections, there are references to the student groups shown "on page 7" of the RFQQ. Please confirm if our responses should speak only to the student groups shown on page 7, or if they also should include the groups shown on page 6.

Answer: Both groups on page 6 and 7 should be included. All diversity of our students should be attended to. The solicitation has been amended for clarity.

7. **Question:** Will the Dyslexia Advisory Committee be evaluating additional Rapid Automatized Naming (RAN) assessment measures to be added to the recommended list during this RFQQ process?

Answer: yes, if all four are attended first, additional will be welcome.

8. **Question:** What is the duration of the approval and inclusion on the vetted list of screeners? It appears that the vetted list will be on the WA website without expiration?

Answer: OSPI is in the process of developing a process for reevaluation. Time Frame to be determined.

9. **Question:** Will there be another opportunity to submit for inclusion in the vetted list?

Answer: We don't know yet.

10. **Question:** The legislation specifies that students in K-2 who display indication of dyslexia be screened. Must this screener be ready for all three grades to be considered?

Answer: No.

11. **Question:** Can a screener be validated for only K or K/1 and be included on the vetted list for those grades?

Answer: This is an open question. Please submit and it will be reviewed by the Dyslexia Council.

12. **Question:** Given that this RFQQ does not result in a contract with OSPI or have a guaranteed volume of work, how much time our staff will be assigned to the project will depend on the number of districts that adopt our product. Can you please provide guidance on how vendors should address this in their responses?

Answer: For the first question: The Dyslexia Advisory Council is more interested in the quality and commitment of support versus quantity of time and will a small district get the same professionalism as a big district.

Vendors should showcase their commitment and process of scaling up or down depending on the needs of the districts.

13. **Question:** Is there a minimum evaluation score that must be reached to be approved? Will all vendors that score over a certain threshold be approved?

Answer: Yes, there will be a minimum evaluation score to be reached and it is to be determined. No, all vendors that score over a certain threshold will not be approved.

14. **Question:** We understand the page limit for our main response document. However, we do have several supplementary documents we'd like to submit that will provide the reviewers with important information. Is it possible to submit ancillary documentation outside of the appendix as separate files?

Answer: Yes, but there is not guarantee they will be read by the reviewers.

15. **Question:** In regards to the mention of data in the Quality of Assessment section (page 16), does OSPI wish to see examples of the reports our data management system can generate, or is this in reference to the data that informed the creation of the assessment?

Answer: This is in reference to the creation of the assessment. Specifically, please address why these measures and specific tools.

16. **Question:** In Section C. Proposal Contents, page 15, Proposals must be formatted to print on eight and one-half by eleven (8 ½ x 11) inch paper size with size 12 font. Can tables within our proposal use a font size that is smaller than 12?

Answer: Yes.

17. **Question:** In Section D. Evaluation and Selection, page 19, Oral presentations via Zoom for twenty (20) minutes will occur on June 8-9, 2020. Should vendors anticipate any questions during the presentation? If so, how much time should we allocate for questions?

Answer: 10 minutes will be allocated for questions.