

# Request for Proposal No. 2020-28

## Addendum 01 – Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the question and answer period of the Washington State Charter School Commission RFP No. 2020-28, issued December 20, 2019.

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](mailto: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.

1. **Question:** Related to Scope of Work section A.4.B.d *Review and present Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Growth Results*: Will the Commission provide the vendor with MAP Growth data for charter schools in the portfolio, or is the vendor expected to work directly with the charter schools and/or NWEA to collect these data?

**Answer:** The consultant will be provided with MAP Growth data.

2. **Question:** Related to Scope of Work A.4.B.e *Develop processes and knowledge for Commission staff to be able to do this work internally in the future*: Will Commission staff have access to common statistical analysis software packages (e.g., R, Stata, SAS, SPSS)?

**Answer:** The Commission has access to Tableau and Excel.

3. **Question:** In Section D.2, we believe the total evaluation points available for the proposal is 200, not 220. Is this correct?

**Answer:** That is correct, 200 points for the grand total. A correction will be formally made in a separate amendment.

4. **Question:** Section A part 3 (Background) states that part of the contractor's assistance to the Commission includes "building capacity in new staff at the Commission to analyze and present this data internally moving forward." In part 4 (Objective and Scope of Work), the RFP states that the contractor will "eventually be responsible for adding internal capacity to the Commission staff." As we write our proposal, should we frame our approach to primarily be a guiding agent to train commission staff through the process of academic performance analysis, or as the primary conductors of the analysis, with documentation and training activities as part of the delivery?

**Answer:** As this contract is able to renew for up to three years, we would like the focus of the contractor to be a guiding agent to train Commission staff, but with the contractor to lead this work, at least for the first round of data. There will be a lot of collaboration with the staff, and the contractor will need to make space for staff to ask questions as they are learning how things are done.

5. **Question:** 1. Does the Commission envision that the Consultant will also analyze School-Specific Goals data under this contract, or just review and provide feedback on those goals?

**Answer:** We hope the consultant will help in the analyzing of school-specific goals under this contract.

6. **Question:** 2. Please clarify the timeline of the winter data release and spring data release and how it fits into the February 2020 to February 2021 timeline.

**Answer:** The data has the following estimated release dates:

December – February NWEA MAP Data

September – State Report Card Data and Proficiency Data

November – Growth Data

April – Washington School Improvement WSIF Data

July – School Specific Goal Results

All of this data will be presented and incorporated into the Academic Performance Reports issued by the Commission.

7. **Question:** 3. Is there a page limit?

**Answer:** There is no set page limit.

8. **Question:** How many schools are in the Commission’s portfolio currently?

**Answer:** There are currently 7 schools operating with 4 slated to open in the 2020-21 school year.

9. To scope the requested work, can the Commission provide a sample data file or data file layout document (list of variables and locations in the data file)? If the Commission cannot share a sample data file or data file layout document, can the Commission please provide the following information about the data to be sent to the selected vendor?

- a. **Question:** Will student personally identifiable information (PII) be included in the data?

**Answer:** There will not be PII in the data sent to the contractor.

- b. **Question:** Will the data be compiled from schools into one or several standard data file formats, or will the Commission be sharing separate data files from each of the charter schools?

**Answer:** The data will be separated by school.

10. **Question:** With regards to “Analyze growth data” on p.5 B.a.i., can the Commission provide more specificity about the type of data that are to be analyzed as well as the type of growth measure to be applied?

**Answer:** Data from Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction’s publically released data on the Washington Student Improvement Framework and Student Report Card will be ran against the Commission’s Academic Performance Framework. Data from the schools on their Northwest Evaluation Association’s MAP Growth will be submitted to

the contractor to analyze and format for distribution and discussion with Commission staff, schools, Commissioners, as well as the general public.

11. With regards to "Provide analysis of other charter schools, not in the Commission's portfolio..." on p.6 B.c., can the Commission provide more information, specifically:
  - c. **Question:** Will the Commission identify these other charter schools?  
**Answer:** Yes, these schools will be identified by the Commission.
  - d. **Question:** Will the data be provided in the same format as the schools that are included in the Commission's portfolio?  
**Answer:** Yes, all of this information will come from the same source with the same formatting.
  
12. **Question:** With regards to "Develop processes and knowledge for Commission staff to be able to do this work internally in the future," does the Commission have a preference with regards to the tools or software that are used for this work?  
**Answer:** We currently have Microsoft Excel and Tableau. Ideally, these would be the tools and software used for this work.
  
13. Can the Commission provide more information regarding the scope of work in applying the Commission's Academic Performance Framework Methodology? Specifically,
  - e. **Question:** Will the Commission provide the Washington School Improvement Framework scores (labeled as the "Necessary data") for measure 1a.1?  
**Answer:** This information is publicly available on the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's website and it would be expected the vendor extracts that data from the data set on the website.
  - f. **Question:** Will the Commission provide the vendor with the ASC school for each student that is needed to compute the measures included in Indicator 2?  
**Answer:** The Commission will provide the ASC school for each student that is needed to computer the measures included in Indicator 2.
  
14. **Question:** With regards to the "Minimum Qualifications" on p. 6, section 5, how will the Commission evaluate bidder proficiency related to bullets 2-6?  
**Answer:** The Commission will assess the bidder's proficiency related to bullets 2-6 by looking at resumes submitted under the Management Proposal, inclusive of resumes and narrative.
  
15. **Question:** The RFP refers to 'Performance Framework' and 'Academic Performance Framework' in various sections. The latter is a subset of the former. Need clarification on scope of effort please.  
**Answer:** The scope of effort will be for the Academic Performance Framework only.

16. **Question:** Section 4.B of the RFP indicates that scope will be limited to downloading and analyzing data. Other section of the RFP indicate that data gathering will also be part of scope. Need clarification please.

**Answer:** Most of the work is downloading an analyzing data that is already produced by either the school or the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Any gathering of data would be done by the Commission staff and presented to the contractor to analyze.

17. **Question:** Section 4.B.c of the RFP indicates that scope will include data analysis on 'other' charter schools not in Commission's portfolio. Need clarification on schools, applications/technology, data availability/permissions.

**Answer:** This data analysis would include publically shared information from Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's website, or would include "national norms" or averages for other schools across that nation, which would also be publically available information.

18. **Question:** Section 4.B.e of the RFP indicates that scope will include developing capability within Commission staff to assume ownership of this effort in the future. What is the skillset of the Commission's nominees?

**Answer:** This development of capabilities would be within Commission staff and specifically of the Oversight Specialists. Please refer to the Commission's website for their bios: <https://charterschool.wa.gov/about-the-commission/staff/>

19. **Question:** List of schools that are part of commission's portfolio for the duration of this RFP.

**Answer:** Operating and authorized schools can be found on the Commission's website: <https://charterschool.wa.gov/what-are-charter-schools/commission-authorized-charter-schools/>

20. **Question:** Has the Commission or other Washington state government entities contracted with a vendor to conduct portions or all of the work specified in this RFP in previous years?

**Answer:** Yes, the Commission has contracted with a vendor in the past to conduct all or parts of the work in this RFP in the past.

21. **Question:** Are all data required for this project publicly available from the Washington State education data portal?

a. Will the vendor be required to request and manipulate student-level data to meet the requirements of this RFP?

**Answer:** There will be a Data Sharing Agreement between the Commission and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, but a majority of the data is based on the Washington State Report Card and is public information. Any student-level data will be done by the Commission staff.

22. On page five of 39, the RFP states that the selected contractor will "eventually be responsible for adding internal capacity to Commission staff and develop processes and systems that are replicable for staff members to continue doing analysis."
- a. **Question:** Does the Commission expect that the selected vendor will provide either remote or in-person training to commission staff?  
**Answer:** The expectation is that the contractor is able to provide remote training to Commission staff.
  - b. **Question:** Is the Commission amenable to a vendor satisfying this requirement through other methods, including provisioning of programming code and documentation?  
**Answer:** The Commission is open to other ways of satisfying this requirement if the method is thoroughly discussed, the information and analysis produced by the method is accurate, and the method is easily transferred to Commission staff for internal capacity purposes, and if the tools necessary to produce this method are already in place by the Commission.
23. **Question:** In section 4.B.a.vi. of the RFP on page five of 39, the RFP contains the following requirement: "Track and update excel file to be used to create annual report using mail merge."
- a. Can the Commission elaborate on the purpose of the mail merge?  
**Answer:** Currently, the data is gathered in Excel and merged into other formats for finalized reporting purposes. We are open-minded to how this is done, but this is the way that some staff are able to use the data that the contractor has analyzed in the past.
24. **Question:** Has the Commission applied the APF to eligible charter schools and published this information in a report that can be shared with interested vendors?  
**Answer:** This information is available on the Commission's website: <https://charterschool.wa.gov/operating/performance-framework/performance-framework-reports/>
25. **Question:** Section 4.B.c. includes a request for an analysis of other charter schools not in the Commission's portfolio. Has the Commission already identified these campuses and used this information in previous analyses? **Answer:** Yes, these schools will already be identified. If so, can the Commission share this with interested vendors? **Answer:** Commission staff will identify the schools based on the student level data and send to the contractor for analysis without any identifiable data, aside from the schools that need to be compared. This will be the Assigned School Comparison in the Academic Performance Framework which compares against the schools students would have otherwise attended, based on their addresses. If not, what are the requirements for identifying these campuses and what are the data sources the Commission expects the vendor to use that are comparable to those that are available for charters within the Commission's portfolio?