

Request for Proposal No. 2022-20

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. 2022-20, issued October 25, 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 PESB, and may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

General Q&A:

1. **Question:** Do we need to pre-register for the meeting at all? Or should we simply use the Zoom link provided to connect? Also, is there a predetermined end time for the pre-bid conference?
2. **Answer:** There is no need to pre-register for the pre-bid conference. Bidders should use the Zoom link provided in the RFP. There is no pre-determined end time for the pre-bid conference, which will end when there are no further questions.
3. **Question:** Is there any penalty if we submit a notice of intent, but then do not submit a final proposal?
Answer: There is no penalty for submitting a notice of intent and not submitting a final proposal.

Due Date Correction to Notice of Intent:

The title page of the RFP inadvertently listed the due date for the required Notice of Intent to submit a proposal as 1:00 p.m., Pacific Time (PT) on 11/15/21. In accordance with Section B.4., Consultants intending to submit a proposal must notify the RFP Coordinator via Notice of Intent to propose no later than **3:00 p.m. PT on 11/15/21.**

Pre-Bid Conference Q&A:

The pre-bid conference Q&A are organized into the following topical areas:

- Professional learning (including questions about providers and schools)
- Evaluation

- Collaboration and Communication
- Policy
- Costs

Professional Learning (PL):

Question PL-1: Have you at the state level talked about values and philosophies of professional learning that you want to see incorporated that are things you've been building on in terms of your own vision and leadership?

Answer PL-1: At the agency level we have not, and we want to work collaboratively with the Contractor to figure this out. At the state level, the legislature has passed several laws providing professional learning guidance that we expect the professional learning provider to follow, as indicated in RFP Section A.4.A.2 and Exhibit H:

- a. [RCW 28A.415.430](#). Professional learning—Defined—Scope.
- b. [RCW 28A.415.432](#). Professional learning—Standards.
- c. [RCW 28A.415.434](#). Professional learning—Definitions

Question PL-2: Does the planning year involve schools much, or is that to be determined?

Answer PL-2: It does involve schools, and each school's big deliverable at the end of the planning year is a project plan. We want the professional learning provider to help schools think through whether their plans make sense, and spot issues they should rethink, things to hone in on, etc. It's up to the professional learning provider to detail how they would work with schools to integrate their professional learning plan with schools' plans.

Question PL-3: The plan is for professional learning to occur during 2022-23 and implementation in 2023-24. Is what you think of as professional learning and what you think of as implementation malleable such that participants put what they learn into play as they are learning?

Answer PL-3: We hope educators are applying their learning as they go. So to an extent it's malleable. But the State Board of Education will have to answer for how we spent the resources the legislature provided us, so we cannot push off implementation for too long. It would be problematic for schools not to have started implementing during 2023-24.

Question PL-4: Are there any technical tools already in use in the state to support/track mastery-based learning that educators are using or have access to (thinking about grading and assessment)?

Answer PL-4: Though such tools exist at a few schools, none are in statewide use.

Question PL-5: This request for proposals envisions working with up to 30 schools. Is it correct to assume that will include all levels?

Answer PL-5: Yes.

Question PL-6: Is there an anticipated number of teachers that would include?

Answer PL-6: We will know more as we select the schools, but at this point we are not really far enough along in the school selection process to know. We anticipate that the January- June 2022 planning period will involve school teams of 6-10 teachers, administrators, and perhaps a student, who are engaging really deeply to begin with. Then the number of participants will grow during 2022-23 and 2023-24 years. That's a working assumption: begin with a smaller subset and then expand.

Question PL-7: Do you plan on having multiple schools from a single district?

Answer PL-7: We did not require it, but some districts do have multiple schools applying.

Question PL-8: How many schools have applied?

Answer PL-8: Eighteen, but we will leave the RFP language at "up to 30," because we may do some additional targeted outreach.

Question PL-9: Will teachers volunteer, be voluntold, or will they receive stipends to participate?

Answer PL-9: It depends on the school. The range of allowable uses for school grants is broad, and it could include paying stipends if the school decides to.

Question PL-10: Is there an expectation that schools will participate in the professional learning that we provide? For example, would principals be expected to participate?

Answer PL-10: That expectation is certainly there for any educators that the school has participating in the initiative, including principals.

Question PL-11: Will you only be selecting one professional learning provider?

Answer PL-11: That is our intent. It may be possible for Bidders to partner with each other, but that would be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Question PL-12: Can you share a list of Bidder's Conference participants so that we can reach out to potential partners?

Answer PL-12: No, but we can develop and share a list of Bidders looking for partners. If you would like for your organization to be added to such a list, please send the following information to contracts@k12.wa.us by 11/23/21:

- Your organization's name
- Your contact person's name, email address, and phone number

Include a reference to RFP 2022-20 in the subject line. By 11/30/21, we share the list electronically with those who are on it.

Evaluation (E)

Question E-1: The first full paragraph from bottom on RFP page 9 says: "The Contractor will work with grantees and the project evaluator in the early stages of this work to ensure the planning period is useful in helping schools evaluate their current structure and processes and

plan for the future” Is the evaluation framework already in place at Aurora Institute, or would the professional learning provider bring their own, or would it be developed together collaboratively during the planning period?

Answer E-1: Aurora Institute (AI) proposed a set of data collection activities and a timeline for those, but left room for mutually determined changes during the evaluation period. Since the professional learning provider will be leading so much of what’s important for the evaluation to understand, collaboration with the professional learning provider is something AI envisioned as part of the evaluation plan.

Question E-2: How will you measure whether mastery-based works or not, so we have that knowledge up front while we’re preparing a proposal?

Answer E-2: The initiative is structured so that the first 6 months (January-June 2022) is planning time for schools. The next year (2022-23) is for professional learning and ramping up on some initial practices. The following year (2023-24) is a more full implementation year. The evaluation is trying to capture all 3 years, but it would not be reasonable for us to expect to see changes in long-term outcome indicators as a result of the initiative within this timeframe. So the evaluation will look more at changes in practices reported by schools, attitudes and behaviors around structure, and culture and pedagogy--3 main foci of mastery-based learning (MBL). That will happen through pre-post surveys, student focus groups, and interviews with key personnel, including teachers, administrators, MBL school teams, and the state professional learning provider. In other words, Aurora Institute will collect data looking at those changes that can be observed during the project timeframe.

Question E-3: Is there an expectation that the professional learning providers would partner in data collection by providing some kind of look for system or look for data collection process, in addition to delivering the content for professional learning?

Answer E-3: Aurora institute (AI) is planning to interview the professional learning provider, who will also report on activities as required in RFP Section A.4.B.2.10. As AI plans and develops evaluation instruments over the next 6-8 months, it will want to ask survey respondents and focus group participants, including teachers and administrators, about what’s happening and how they’ve changed. AI could also have that kind of conversation as part of its interview with the professional learning provider. Some of the specifics of the questions on the surveys and in the interviews (which are part of site visit observations) have not been developed yet, but AI anticipates that some of the great work that’s been done in the field around look fors and best practices would be part of what AI asks about and looks for. The evaluation team welcomes the professional learning provider’s input.

Also, RFP Section C.3.v says “Outcomes and Performance Measurement (Scored) – Describe the impacts/outcomes the Consultant proposes to achieve as a result of the delivery of these services including how these outcomes would be monitored, measured, and reported to the state agency. Include potential feedback tools and mechanisms to evaluate the professional learning program for SBE and the project evaluator to consider using.” In other words, we are

looking to understand the outcomes and impacts you are looking for and your ideas for measuring those. We'll use that to inform our discussions of what the evaluation will look like.

Question E-4: It seems that there is a relatively strong focus on culturally responsive education. How will the evaluation look at changes related to culturally responsive and sustaining education (CRSE) and other issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion? Is there a plan for how evaluation of CRSE will happen?

Answer E-4: We are still in the evaluation planning stage where the State Board of Education and Aurora Institute need to have conversations about how the different data collection activities will bring in all the different pieces of this work. Clearly CRSE is an important part of what we will be evaluating, but we have not discussed specific ways for integrating it into the data collection activities. We welcome contractor expertise to help inform our thinking on what this will look like.

Collaboration and Communication (CC)¹

Question CC-1: Please clarify Section A.4.B.2.6, which says "Design, coordinate, and facilitate 9 online quarterly regional meetings (central, east, and west, 3 quarters per year, except 1 quarter for fiscal year 2022) either face to face, or online." In particular, are you open to either face-to-face or online delivery?

Answer CC-1: We are open to either online or face-to-face delivery. Bidders can propose whatever they think is best and budget accordingly. Depending on which schools get funded, we anticipate three regions. Each region would have a spring meeting between April and June 2022, followed by 3 quarterly meetings per school year during 2022-23 and 2023-24, for a total of 7 quarterly meetings per region (i.e. 21 meetings across all 3 regions) over the life of the project.

Question CC-2: Tell us about your sense around community engagement and whether there's a philosophical stance you are taking or a state message communication strategy you have got in place that is already underway. If so, can we see it?

Answer CC-2: Since this is new funding and relatively new work to be thinking about this kind of statewide collaborative project, we do not have a statewide communication plan in place yet, but we know we need one. We have looked at where some of this work has happened in other states and the impact of communication at the state or local level. It is something we want to intentionally design during the planning period. Key questions at the state level include how to create tools and sample messaging for schools to use and how can we better support the schools based on what they tell us their needs are around communications and community engagement.

¹ Refer to RFP sections A.4.B.2.4 and A.4.B.2.9 to see context for questions CC-2 and CC3.

Question CC-3: In our proposal, can we talk about work that should be done with partner organizations, professional organizations, and key nonprofits in the state as part of the work that is necessary and should be budgeted, or should we really focus the budgeting much more tightly on professional learning for teachers, educators, and schools?

Answer CC-3: RFP Section C.3.ii, which describes work plan requirements, gives you freedom to talk about this work, but see the response to the next question stating that professional learning is the top priority. Also, RFP section A.4.B.1.5.e asks you to include in your work plan a description of SBE staff involvement you require. For example, your response could be an opportunity for you to suggest statewide outreach efforts if you wanted them to happen but didn't want to include the cost in your own proposal.

Question CC-4: You've got a lot of different agencies, schools, and other folks involved and you've got a local or national team coming in do all this work. If you start diverting attention to other places, such as collaboration, then something gives. What are your priorities for how the Contractor interacts with collaborative opportunities (knowing that collaboration can offer great opportunities but also demands substantial time), and do you have a team who are prioritizing things as we are going along?

Answer CC-4: The RFP is about professional learning, and that has to be the biggest priority. But we would like to see things like community engagement and other important aspects come through as much as feasible. Whoever ends up being the professional learning provider will be working closely with the Mastery-Based Learning Collaborative Director to figure things out. Even though we do not have as many answers as we would like to right now, we can figure that out together.

Policy (P)

Question P-1: How would this project shape policy? Are we thinking specifically this should inform policy around professional learning and around professional qualifications and around the work of professionals in WA state; or is it all possible structures and systems, in which case, what is the role of the provider around supporting you in thinking about policy? How are you thinking about that in your efforts to glean what kinds of policies are in the way of kids becoming competent?

Answer P-1: We welcome the professional learning provider's thoughts around policy barriers and things that you would want to see changed. The education governance structure in Washington is complex. The State Board of Education's role is to define things like instructional time, graduation requirements, subject area and credit requirements, and accountability systems. We are trying to get to a policy that really supports non-credit types of models. We expect this initiative could shape State Board of Education policy around policy areas such as graduation requirements and accountability systems (to try to better recognize mastery-based programs). It could also influence policy under other agencies' authority, such as funding for mastery-based programs, which is under the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's authority, and educator certification and credentialing, which are under the Professional

Educator Standards Board's authority. Both of these agencies are executive sponsors of this initiative.

Costs (C)

Question C-1: Since this is a performance-based project are the costs of meetings to be included by the Contractor?

Answer C-1: Costs of meetings that the contractor is hosting are to be covered by fees the contractor charges for deliverables. If you are thinking of hosting an in-person meeting, take costs such as meals, room, and technology into account in the fees that you charge. On a related note, ensure your fees cover all your travel costs, including those related to meetings (regardless of who is hosting).