

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

**Request for Proposals No. 2020-24
Addendum 01 – Q&A**

Note to potential respondents:

This Addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2020-24, issued October 18, 2019.

All amendments, addendums, and notifications will be posted on the [OSPI website](#) (if this was an open procurement) and released via the Washington Electronic Business Solution ([WEBS](#)) website.

1. **QUESTION:** Do you anticipate a need for any qualitative data collected from the sites?
ANSWER: Possibly, depending on state level need, and the flexibility to do any pilot studies on high performing projects.
2. **QUESTION:** Do you anticipate a need for program observations included in our methodology?
ANSWER: Possibly, depending on state level need, and the flexibility to do any pilot studies on high performing projects.
3. **QUESTION:** Are you open to firm, fixed price proposals (rather than billing separately for travel)?
ANSWER: Yes. OSPI prefers proposals that are inclusive of travel.
4. **QUESTION:** The anticipated timeline shows that the development of the statewide data collection system will occur from Feb 2020 – Jan 2022. When during that timeline would OSPI like the system in place at the CCLCs?
ANSWER: This is to be determined, depending on when the system is ready within that timeline.
5. **QUESTION:** What data collection system are you currently using at the state level, if any? Is that system vendor eligible to submit a proposal to this RFP?
ANSWER: There is not currently a state level data system.

6. **QUESTION:** *In the RFP, there are two places that training and technical assistance are referenced related to the 21APR data system:*
- a. *Objective 4a: Provide opportunities for grantee staff to become proficient in using the 21APR data system and validating their own data.*
 - b. *Objective 6a: Provide technical assistance to grantees and their local evaluators to enable reliable and accurate data collection and reporting for 21APR federal reporting. Does OSPI envision the focus of the training and technical assistance referenced in each of these objectives to be substantively different from one another?*

ANSWER: The training and technical assistance will depend on grantee and state level needs.

7. **QUESTION:** *In the RFP, there are two places that training and technical assistance are referenced related to the 21APR data system:*
- c. *Objective 4a: Provide opportunities for grantee staff to become proficient in using the 21APR data system and validating their own data.*
 - d. *Objective 6a: Provide technical assistance to grantees and their local evaluators to enable reliable and accurate data collection and reporting for 21APR federal reporting. Would 4a be related to providing training and technical assistance on the navigation and use of 21APR?*

ANSWER: Yes, and have the ability to provide TA go grantees as needed.

8. **QUESTION:** *In the RFP, there are two places that training and technical assistance are referenced related to the 21APR data system:*
- e. *Objective 4a: Provide opportunities for grantee staff to become proficient in using the 21APR data system and validating their own data.*
 - f. *Objective 6a: Provide technical assistance to grantees and their local evaluators to enable reliable and accurate data collection and reporting for 21APR federal reporting. Would 6a be related to providing center-level 21APR reports for grantees to enter into the system directly?*

ANSWER: Yes, this could mean providing center level reports as well as providing TA to collect the information from grantees to create center level reports.

9. **QUESTION:** *Under Objective 5d, the RFP notes refining the grantee RFP scoring rubric with an intentional focus on equity. OSPI's Office of Equity and Civil Rights notes the following topics under equity: 504 Plans and Disability; Employment; Gender Identity and Gender Expression; Interpretation and Translation; Religion; Sex Equity in Athletics; Sexual Harassment; Student Discipline. Are there any specific issues/topics that OSPI would like us to consider in relation to how we think about equity in the RFP scoring process?*

ANSWER: This is to be determined based off of 21st CCLC administrative staff with the help of the evaluator to determine areas of the state where CCLC funding is not present.

10. **QUESTION:** *Under Objective 8d, the RFP notes that the evaluator should: "Provide data and information about what extent youth who stay engaged in 21st CCLC programming show growth on the youth development-related outcomes measured on the youth survey."* Could OSPI clarify the time points the evaluator should consider for these analyses? For example, should the evaluator consider data from student participants from the 2019-20 program year and forward, or does OSPI envision the evaluator using data from prior programming periods?

ANSWER: This indicator is relative to the longitudinal study/assessment. Therefore, OSPI envisions the evaluator using data from prior programming periods.

11. **QUESTION:** I didn't see any programming experience required under Consultant Qualifications (page 10). Is it correct to assume that this project focuses mainly on evaluation and that development of a statewide system similar to EZ reports means developing specifications for such a system; and that developing a dashboard means developing specifications for a dashboard -- and that the programming work would be completed by OSPI staff in collaboration with the contractor's specifications? (Specifications would be developed based on stakeholder needs)

ANSWER: Programming work would not be done by OSPI staff; rather, programming work would be done by a contractor. Many of the specifications have already been created by the current contractor, and OSPI has the rights to the tools created under the current contract. OSPI needs a data collection system that will inform 21st CCLC program staff with up to date information such as attendance, activities, staffing, etc. The contractor has many duties other than just focusing on statewide evaluation.

12. **QUESTION:** What is currently being used to collect the APR data (attendance, activities, staffing, etc.)? If you have estimates by proportion of grantees (e.g., 25% are utilizing EZ Reports, 25% are using their own developed systems, etc.), that would be helpful.

ANSWER: About half of the sites are using EZ reports. Some grantees/sites have their own in-house systems for collecting attendance, activities, and staffing.

13. **QUESTION:** Are the prior evaluators (AIR / Weikart Center) eligible to bid on this opportunity?

ANSWER: Any entity that meets the required minimum qualifications and can provide the services listed in the RFP may bid on this opportunity.

14. **QUESTION:** The RfP cites specific tools and reports that may be proprietary (Weikart Center and AIR appear to be original developers). These include "refine and enhance Leading Indicators Reports" (pg. 6), "Student Motivation, Engagement and Beliefs Survey" (pg. 7), and "Staff and Coordinator Leading Indicator Survey" (pg. 8). Does OSPI have full rights to edit/use these tools and would this extend to the new evaluator? Is OSPI open to alternative surveys/reports?

ANSWER: OSPI has rights to the tools that were created under the contractual relationship with American Institutes for research. The Weikart Center has proprietary assessments tools, such as the Youth Program Quality Assessment (PQA). The PQA data has been used as an extension of the Leading Indicator reports to provide additional data points for subgrantees to target areas of improvement.

15. **QUESTION:** Is the YPQA completed annually by the local evaluators or other external assessors? And is the only responsibility of the state evaluator with respect to the YPQA to gather this information from the individual grantees?

ANSWER: In Washington, it's required that each site gets an external assessment once per year, and a self-assessment once per year. In most programs, the local evaluator is also the external assessor.

16. **QUESTION:** On page 19, the RfP states: "*Outcomes and Performance Measurement – 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.*" Are you requesting the impacts/outcomes that we are proposing to achieve due to delivery of *evaluation* services OR that we expect to measure due to 21st CCLC services?

ANSWER: It is expected that the statewide evaluator do both.

17. **QUESTION:** The 21st CCLC website indicates that Local Evaluation Guidelines will be available Fall 2019. Is this available so we can review new expectations re: these reports?

ANSWER: The Local Evaluation Guidelines are not ready for dissemination yet. It is expected that a draft will be available to grantees November 15, 2019, and available to the public by December 31, 2019.

18. **QUESTION:** Is the OSPI 21st CCLC Logic Model and/or Continuous Improvement Plan available for review to help assist with the evaluation design?

ANSWER: We do not have a Washington State Logic Model, but we have state goals and key performance indicators. All key performance indicators/objectives are listed in the RFP – see page 5 under “KEY OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS”

19. **QUESTION:** On page 6, it states: “3d - Develop a 21st CCLC Program Data Dashboard to identify high, medium and low performing programs.” Can you provide additional details on who the users are and what do you envision it looking like in terms of accessibility for grantees?

ANSWER: The data dashboard was created by American Institutes for Research and is used internally by OSPI 21st CCLC program staff. It’s used for various reasons: to monitor risk and inform monitoring and to identify strong programs and identify best practices. Several data points are collected by AIR to aggregate the high, medium, and low performing projects.

20. **QUESTION:** On page 6, it states: “ 5 - Refine annual competitive competition to validate the request for proposals (RFP) and scoring rubric to authenticate the process.” We have access to the RfP for the competition from your website but can you share the scoring rubric that you are currently using so we can customize our response?

ANSWER: The [scoring rubric](#) is located on the 21st CCLC website.

21. **QUESTION:** On page 7, it states: “Longitudinal study/assessment of how sustained participation in 21st CCLC programming across multiple years may be related to youth development outcomes measured on the Student Motivation, Engagement, and Beliefs Survey and school-related outcomes derived from state data warehouses maintained by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)”. How will the existing data be shared with or accessed by the new evaluator and who will provide this data?

ANSWER: OSPI has rights to the tools that were created under the contractual relationship with American Institutes for research. A data sharing agreement between the successful bidder and OSPI may define how the data from previous years will be accessed.