

Request for Qualifications & Quotations No. 2023-07

Rapid Automatized Naming Assessments

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

PRE-BID CONFERENCE: 2:00 p.m., Pacific Time (PT) on November 2, 2022

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: 3:00 p.m., Pacific Time (PT) on November 21, 2022

ESTIMATED CONTRACT PERIOD: This RFQQ will not result in a contract with OSPI. Instead, OSPI will publish a vetted list of academic screening tools for school districts to access. Amendments extending the period of performance, if any, shall be at the sole discretion of OSPI.

CONSULTANT ELIGIBILITY: This solicitation is open to those Consultants who satisfy the minimum qualifications stated herein and that are available for work in Washington State.

SUBMIT PROPOSAL TO: contracts@k12.wa.us

All communications concerning this RFQQ must be directed only to the RFQQ Coordinator via email. Any other communication will be considered unofficial and non-binding on OSPI. Consultants are to rely on written statements issued by the RFQQ Coordinator. Communication directed to parties other than the RFQQ Coordinator may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

This RFQQ is available at the [Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction \(OSPI\) website](#) and at the Department of Enterprise Services, [Washington Electronic Business Solution \(WEBS\) Procurement website](#). All RFQQ amendments and/or Consultant questions and OSPI answers will be posted to these sites. All interested Consultants must be registered with WEBS under the following commodity codes in order to receive automatic notifications: 785-85: Reading Programs, Reading Aids, Accelerators, and Calculators; 920-15: Assessment and Profiling Services of Software; 924-18: Educational Services, Alternative; 924-20: Examination and Testing; 924-74: Special Education

OSPI, and its contractors and subcontractors, must not discriminate in any programs or services based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, marital status, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation, gender expression, gender identity, disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability, and must comply with state and federal nondiscrimination laws, including Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at 360-725-6162/TTY: 360-664-3631; or P.O. Box 47200, Olympia, WA 98504-7200; or equity@k12.wa.us.



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Table of Contents

Section A. INTRODUCTION	4
A.1. DEFINITIONS.....	4
A.2. PURPOSE OF REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS.....	6
A.3. BACKGROUND	6
A.4. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF WORK.....	7
A.5. BIDDER QUALIFICATIONS	8
A.6. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE.....	9
A.7. FUNDING	9
A.8. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT.....	9
Section B. GENERAL INFORMATION FOR BIDDERS	10
B.1. RFQQ COORDINATOR	10
B.2. QUESTIONS & ANSWERS	10
B.3. ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES	10
B.4. PRE-BID CONFERENCE	11
B.5. COMPLAINT PROCEDURE.....	11
B.6. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS	12
B.7. PROPRIETARY INFORMATION/PUBLIC DISCLOSURE	13
B.8. ADDENDUMS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RFQQ	13
B.9. SMALL BUSINESS, MINORITY & WOMEN'S BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (MWBE), AND VETERAN-OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION	14
B.10. ETHICS, POLICIES, & LAW.....	14
B.11. ACCEPTANCE PERIOD	14
B.12. RESPONSIVENESS	15
B.13. MOST FAVORABLE TERMS	15
B.14. COSTS TO PROPOSE	15
B.15. NO OBLIGATION TO AWARD	16
B.16. REJECTION OF PROPOSALS	16
Section C. PROPOSAL CONTENTS	17

C.1. PROPOSAL OVERVIEW	17
C.2. LETTER OF SUBMITTAL	17
C.3. MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL	17
C.4. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	18
C.5. COST PROPOSAL	20
Section D. EVALUATION AND AWARD	21
D.1. EVALUATION PROCEDURE	21
D.2. EVALUATION WEIGHTING AND SCORING	21
D.3. REFERENCE CHECKS	21
D.4. SELECTION OF APPARENT SUCCESSFUL BIDDER	21
D.5. NOTIFICATION TO BIDDERS	22
D.6. DEBRIEFING OF UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS	22
D.7. PROTEST PROCEDURE	22
Section E. RFQQ EXHIBITS	24
EXHIBIT A	25
EXHIBIT B	27
EXHIBIT C	28

Section A. INTRODUCTION

A.1. DEFINITIONS

Definitions for the purposes of this RFQQ include:

Academic Screener – Screeners are brief, reliable, and valid assessment used to assist educators with identifying students who are at-risk or not-at risk for specific academic difficulties and or dyslexia.

- Screening tools have the following characteristics:
 - Quick and targeted assessments of discrete skills
 - Standardized directions for administration and scoring
 - Screeners are culturally and linguistically relevant
 - Have established reliability and validity standards

Agency or OSPI – The Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction; the entity issuing this RFQQ.

Amendment – A unilateral change to the Solicitation that is issued by OSPI at its sole discretion and posted on WEBS and OSPI's website.

Apparent Successful Bidder (ASB) – A Bidder submitting a response to this Solicitation that is evaluated and is identified and announced by OSPI as providing the best value to the Agency.

Bid – An offer, proposal, or quote for goods or services submitted in response to this RFQQ.

Bidder – Individual organization, public or private agency submitting a proposal in response to this Solicitation. For purposes of this Solicitation, the terms Bidder, Consultant, and Vendor are interchangeable.

Competitive Solicitation – A documented formal process providing an equal and open opportunity to Bidders or Consultants culminating in a selection based on predetermined criteria.

Complaint – A process that may be followed by a Consultant prior to the deadline for bid submission to alert OSPI of certain types of asserted deficiencies in the Solicitation.

Consultant – Individual organization, public or private agency submitting a proposal in response to this Solicitation. For purposes of this Solicitation, the terms Bidder, Consultant, and Vendor are interchangeable.

Contractor – Individual or company whose proposal has been accepted by OSPI and is awarded a fully executed, written contract.

Debriefing – A short meeting an unsuccessful Bidder may request with the Coordinator following the announcement of the Apparent Successful Bidder for the purpose of receiving information regarding the review and evaluation of that Bidder's Response.

Dyslexia – Defined in statute ([E2SSB 6162](#) or see supporting documents) as a specific learning disorder that is neurological in origin and characterized by:

- Unexpected difficulties with accurate or fluent word recognition and
- Poor spelling and decoding abilities that are not consistent with the person's intelligence, motivation, and sensory capabilities.
- These difficulties typically result from a deficit in the phonological components of language that is often unexpected in relation to other cognitive abilities. The resultant difficulties are not typically a result of ineffective classroom instruction. Secondary consequences may include problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that can impede growth of vocabulary and background knowledge.

Dyslexia Advisory Council (DAC) – A council of stakeholders convened for the purposes of implementing E2SSB 6162: Early Screening of Dyslexia. The members will serve two (2) years without compensation for their time.

Proposal – A formal offer submitted in response to this RFQQ.

Proprietary Information – Information such as patents, technological information or other related information that the Bidder or Consultant does not want released or shared with the public.

Protest – A process that may be followed by a Bidder after the announcement of the Apparent Successful Bidder to alert OSPI to certain types of alleged errors in the evaluation of the Solicitation.

Rapid Automatized Naming – The ability to quickly name aloud a series of familiar items. This includes letters, numbers, colors, and objects found in a classroom. Please note the skills assessed during this assessment cannot be pre-taught or remediated.

Request for Qualifications and Quotations (RFQQ) – Formal procurement document in which a service or need is identified. Consultants are invited to submit their bid, detailing their qualifications, and a proposed cost to complete the described activities.

RCW – The Revised Code of Washington.

Responsible Bidder – An individual, organization, public or private agency, or other entity that has demonstrated the capability to meet all the requirements of the Solicitation and meets the elements of responsibility. (See RCW 39.26.160 (2))

Responsive Bidder – An individual, organization, public or private agency, or other entity who has submitted a Bid that fully conforms in all material respects to the Solicitation and all its requirements, in both form and substance.

RFQQ Coordinator – An individual or designee who is employed by OSPI and who is responsible for conducting this Solicitation.

Solicitation – A formal process providing an equal and open opportunity for Bidders culminating in a selection based upon predetermined criteria.

Subcontractor – An individual or other entity contracted by a Consultant to perform part of the services or to provide goods under the Contract resulting from this Solicitation. Subcontractors, if allowed, are subject to the advance approval of OSPI.

Vendor – Individual organization, public or private agency submitting a proposal in response to this Solicitation. For purposes of this Solicitation, the terms Bidder, Consultant, and Vendor are interchangeable.

WEBS – Washington’s Electronic Business Solution, the Consultant notification system found at [Washington Electronic Business Solution \(WEBS\) Procurement website](#) and maintained by the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services.

A.2. PURPOSE OF REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is initiating this Request for Qualifications and Quotations (RFQQ) to solicit proposals from publishers and vendors of Rapid Automatized Naming (RAN) assessments. The purpose of this RFQQ is to provide school districts with additional RAN assessment options for Washington State school districts to implement the early screening of dyslexia as required under [E2SSB 6162](#)-Early Screening of Dyslexia. This RFQQ will not result in a contract with OSPI. Instead, OSPI will publish a vetted list of academic screening tools for school districts to access.

A.3. BACKGROUND

Led by Superintendent Chris Reykdal, OSPI is the primary agency charged with overseeing public K-12 education in Washington state. Working with the state's two hundred ninety-five (295) public school districts, six (6) state-tribal education compact schools, and public charter schools,

OSPI allocates funding and provides tools, resources, and technical assistance so every student in Washington is provided a high-quality public education.

In the Spring of 2018, the Washington State Legislature passed [E2SSB 6162](#)-Early Screening of Indicators for Dyslexia.

Beginning with the 2018-19 school year, as part of the annual student assessment inventory, report the number of students and grade levels of the students screened, disaggregated by student subgroups, aggregate the school reports, and submit the report to the superintendent of public instruction.

Beginning in the 2021-22 school year, each school district, state-tribal education compact schools, and public charter school is required to:

- (1)** Screen students in kindergarten through second grade and provide interventions to those students who display below grade level literacy development or indications of dyslexia;
- (2)** Begin, whenever possible, by providing student supports in the general education classroom;
- (3)** If after receiving interventions, further screening tools and resources indicate that a student continues to have indications of dyslexia, recommend to their parents and family that they be evaluated for dyslexia or a specific learning disability; and

School districts may use learning assistance program allocations to meet screening and intervention requirements, even if the student being screened or provided with supports is not eligible to participate in that program.

A.4. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF WORK

A. Objective:

During the Fall of 2022, the Dyslexia Advisory Council (DAC) will review academic screeners generated from this RFQQ for the purpose of identifying additional academic screening assessment options tools to be used by Washington school districts in accordance with RCW expectations of the early screening of dyslexia. The DAC will recommend their list of additional academic screening assessment options to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and publish the list in January 2023.

B. Scope of Work:

As a result of this RFQQ, OSPI will then publish a vetted list of academic screening tools on its website. Under [Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 6162](#), Washington school districts may purchase from the vetted list of academic screeners

or select their own screening tools for expected implementation by School Year 2022-23.

A.5. BIDDER QUALIFICATIONS

Minimum Qualifications:

- Licensed to do business in the State of Washington. If not licensed, provide a written intent to become licensed in Washington within thirty (30) calendar days of being selected as the Apparent Successful Bidder.
- Knowledge of foundational reading and rapid automatized naming (must comprise all four criteria: **colors, numbers, letters, and familiar objects**) skills for Washington State implementation.
- Have the capacity to support multiple districts at one time without diminishing the implementation process or fidelity of the tool.

Consultants who do not meet these minimum qualifications will be rejected as non-responsive and will not receive further consideration. Any proposal that is rejected as non-responsive will not be evaluated or scored.

Desirable Qualifications:

- Ability to work with diverse educators, classified staff, and administrators to ensure successful implementation of the screener/tool.
- Ability to work with diverse sized districts from very small (twelve (12) students) to very large (fifty thousand (50,000) students).
- Experience in working with diverse districts including urban, suburban, and rural communities.
- Experience working with diverse student populations: (See Chart on Page 9)

Student Groups	Percentage of Washington State Population
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.3%
Asian	8.5%
Black/African American	4.6%
Hispanic/Latino of Any Race	25.2%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.3%
Two or More Races	9.2%
White	49.9%
Female	48.2%
Male	51.5%
Gender X	0.3%
Students Learning the English Language	12.5%
Low Income Students	47.6%
Total Student Enrollment for WA State (2021-22)	1,091,429

A.6. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

This RFQQ will not result in a contract with OSPI. Instead, OSPI will publish a vetted list of academic screening tools for school districts to access. School districts may choose to purchase services from vendors on the list. Districts will contact vendors directly and negotiate contract terms, including period of performance, individually.

A.7. FUNDING

This RFQQ will not result in a contract with OSPI. Instead, OSPI will publish a vetted list of academic screeners/tools for school districts to access. School districts may choose to purchase services from vendors on the list. Districts will contact vendors directly and negotiate contract terms, including cost, individually.

A.8. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

OSPI complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Consultants may contact the RFQQ Coordinator to receive this RFQ in an alternative format.

Section B. GENERAL INFORMATION FOR BIDDERS

B.1. RFQQ COORDINATOR

The RFQQ Coordinator is the sole point of contact in OSPI for this procurement. All communication between the Consultant and OSPI upon receipt of this RFQQ shall be with the RFQQ Coordinator, as follows:

Contact Information	
Name:	Kyla Moore
Address:	600 Washington Street South PO Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200
Email Address:	contracts@k12.wa.us

B.2. QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Any questions or communications concerning this RFQQ must be directed only to the RFQQ Coordinator noted in Section B.1. Questions and/or inquiries must be sent via email and should include the RFQQ number. Consultants are to rely on written statements issued by the RFQQ Coordinator. Communication directed to parties other than the RFQQ Coordinator will be considered unofficial and non-binding on OSPI, and may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

B.3. ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES

Item	Action	Date
1.	OSPI issues RFQQ	October 26, 2022
2.	Question and Answer period	October 26- November 21, 2022
3.	OSPI hosts Pre-bid Conference	November 2, 2022
4.	Last date for questions regarding RFQQ	November 7, 2022
5.	Complaints due	November 14, 2022
6.	OSPI posts final Question and Answer Addendum or Amendment (if necessary)	November 10, 2022
7.	Proposals due	November 21, 2022

Item	Action	Date
8.	OSPI conducts evaluation of written proposals	November 21, 2022-January 16, 2023
9.	OSPI announces "Apparent Successful Bidder" and sends notification to unsuccessful Bidder(s)	January 16, 2023
10.	OSPI conducts debriefing conferences (if requested)	As requested, per debriefing instructions

OSPI reserves the right to revise the above schedule.

B.4. PRE-BID CONFERENCE

A pre-bid conference is scheduled to be held on November 2, 2022, at 2:00 p.m. PT. The -re-bid conference will be held virtually:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us04web.zoom.us/j/75917686424?pwd=cdEQBiwlDyyBhkMo4QRotOAbkUDvHJ.1>

Meeting ID: 759 1768 6424

Passcode: UsMd8K

All prospective Consultants should attend; however, attendance is not mandatory. Written questions may be submitted in advance to the RFQQ Coordinator. OSPI shall be bound only to written answers to questions. Any oral responses given at the pre-bid conference shall be considered unofficial.

Questions arising at the pre-bid conference or in subsequent communication with the RFQQ Coordinator will be documented and answered in written form. A copy of the questions and answers in the form of an Addendum will be published on the [OSPI website](#) and released on WEBS under the commodity code(s) listed on the cover page of this RFQQ.

Within five (5) business days of the pre-bid conference, a copy of the questions and answers from the pre-bid conference will be placed on the OSPI website and released on WEBS.

B.5. COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

The complaint process is available to Consultants interested in this RFQQ. The complaint process allows Consultants to focus on the Solicitation requirements and evaluation process and raise issues with these processes early enough in the process to allow OSPI to correct a problem before proposals are submitted and time expended on evaluations.

A Consultant may submit a complaint based on any of the following:

- The Solicitation unnecessarily restricts competition;
- The Solicitation evaluation or scoring process is unfair or flawed; or
- The Solicitation requirements are inadequate or insufficient to prepare a proposal.

Consultants may submit complaints up to five (5) business days prior to the proposal due date noted in the Estimated Schedule of Procurement Activities. However, Consultants are encouraged to submit complaints as soon as possible so OSPI can rectify the issue(s) early in the process. Complaints must be submitted to the RFQQ Coordinator. In order to be considered a valid complaint, the complaint must meet the following requirements:

- Must be in writing.
- Should clearly articulate the basis for the complaint.
- Should include a proposed remedy.

Complaints not received by the deadline noted in the Estimated Schedule of Procurement Activities will not be reviewed by OSPI. Failure by the Bidder to raise a complaint at this stage may waive its right for later consideration.

The OSPI Contracts Administrator or an employee delegated by the Contracts Administrator will review valid complaints and respond to the submitter in writing. OSPI will consider all complaints but is not required to adopt a complaint, in part or in full. OSPI's response to the complaint is final and not subject to administrative appeal. The response, and any changes to the RFQQ, will be posted as an amendment to WEBS prior to the proposal due date. Any complaint addressed during the complaint process cannot be raised during the protest process.

B.6. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Consultants shall submit proposals as an attachment to an email to the RFQQ Coordinator noted in Section B.1. ***Proposals must arrive by 3:00 p.m. in Olympia, WA, on November 23, 2022.*** The RFQQ number must be noted in the email subject line. Attachments to the email shall be Microsoft Word format or in Portable Document Format (PDF). Zipped files may be received by OSPI and can be used for submission of proposals. OSPI does not assume responsibility for any problems with the electronic delivery of materials.

Proposals not received by the deadline will not be reviewed. Late proposals will not be accepted and will be automatically disqualified from further consideration. Proposals must respond to the procurement requirements. Do not respond by referring to material presented elsewhere. The proposal must be complete and must stand on its own merits.

Failure to respond to any portion of the procurement document may result in rejection of the proposal as non-responsive. All proposals and any accompanying documentation become the property of OSPI and will not be returned.

B.7. PROPRIETARY INFORMATION/PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Your entire response to this RFQQ is a public record and will be disclosed consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW. Bid submissions and evaluations are temporarily exempt from public disclosure until announcement of the ASB(s).

B.8.i. CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

For the purposes of this RFQQ, do not include confidential or proprietary information unless specifically requested by OSPI.

If OSPI requests confidential or proprietary information, you must clearly print the word "Confidential" on the lower right-hand corner of each page containing the confidential or proprietary information.

B.8.ii. PUBLIC RECORDS REQUESTS

If a public records request seeks your proposal and the proposal contains pages clearly marked "Confidential", OSPI will take the following steps:

- i. We will notify you. We will identify the requestor and the date that OSPI will disclose the requested records.
- ii. We will give you an opportunity to seek a court order to stop OSPI from disclosing the records.
- iii. We will not evaluate or defend your claim of confidentiality. We will not withhold or redact your documents without a court order.

If you have any questions, refer to the [OSPI Public Records Office](#).

B.8. ADDENDUMS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RFQQ

In the event it becomes necessary to revise any part of this RFQQ, an addendum or an amendment will be published on the [OSPI website](#). For this purpose, the published Consultant questions and Agency answers, and any other pertinent information, shall be considered an addendum to the RFQQ. Additionally, all addenda referred to above will be released on WEBS under the commodity code(s) listed on the cover page of this RFQQ. Only consultants who have properly registered in WEBS will receive automatic notification of amendments or other correspondence pertaining to this RFQQ. For those not registered in [WEBS](#), it will be the responsibility of interested Consultants to check the website periodically for addenda and amendments to the RFQQ.

B.9. SMALL BUSINESS, MINORITY & WOMEN'S BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (MWBE), AND VETERAN-OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

In accordance with the legislative findings and policies set forth in chapter [39.19 RCW](#), the State of Washington encourages participation in all of its contracts by firms certified by the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises (OMWBE). Participation may be either on a direct basis in response to this RFQQ or on a subcontractor basis. For more information on certification, contact the [Washington Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises](#).

43.60A.200 encourages the participation of Veteran and Service Member Owned Businesses certified by the Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs RCW [43.60A.195](#). For more information on certification, contact [Washington State Department of Veteran Affairs](#).

Additionally, per Department of Enterprise policy, agencies are encouraged to buy from in-state small business, including microbusinesses and minibusinesses.

However, no preference will be included in the evaluation of proposals, no minimum level of MWBE participation shall be required as a condition for receiving an award, and proposals will not be rejected or considered non-responsive on that basis. Any affirmative action requirements set forth in federal regulations or statutes included or referenced in the contract documents will apply.

Vendors who meet criteria set forth in chapter [39.19 RCW](#), should completed and submit the *Business Enterprise Certification Form* with the *Contractor Intake Form*.

B.10. ETHICS, POLICIES, & LAW

This RFQQ, the evaluation of proposals, and any resulting contract shall be made in conformance with applicable Washington State laws and Policies.

Specific restrictions apply to contracting with current or former state employees pursuant to RCW 42.52. Bidders should familiarize themselves with the requirements prior to submitting a proposal. Bidders shall indicate on their *Contractor Intake Form* any current or former state employees who are employed by, or subcontracted with, Bidder.

B.11. ACCEPTANCE PERIOD

Proposals must provide ninety (90) business days for acceptance by OSPI from the due date for receipt of proposals.

B.12. RESPONSIVENESS

All proposals will be reviewed by the RFQQ Coordinator to determine compliance with administrative and minimum requirements and instructions specified in this RFQQ. OSPI may reject a Proposal as nonresponsive at any time for any of the following reasons:

- Incomplete Response
- Submission of a Response that proposes services that deviate from the scope and technical requirements set forth in this document
- Failure to meet the minimum Bidder qualifications or to comply with any requirement set forth in this RFQQ, including Attachments
- Submission of incorrect, misleading or false information
- History of prior unsatisfactory contractual performance

The RFQQ Coordinator may contact any Bidder for clarification of the proposal. If a proposal is deemed non-responsive, it shall be removed from further consideration. Bidders whose proposals are found to be non-responsive shall be disqualified from further evaluation and shall be notified in writing.

If a proposal meets all administrative and Bidder qualification requirements and submittal instructions, OSPI shall continue with the written evaluation and, if applicable, the oral evaluation.

OSPI reserves the right at its sole discretion to waive minor administrative irregularities.

B.13. MOST FAVORABLE TERMS

OSPI reserves the right to make an award without further discussion of the proposal submitted. Therefore, the proposal should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms which the Bidder can propose. There will be no best and final offer procedure. OSPI does reserve the right to contact a Bidder for clarification of its proposal.

It is understood that the proposal will become a part of the official procurement file on this matter without obligation to OSPI.

B.14. COSTS TO PROPOSE

OSPI will not be liable for any costs incurred by the Consultant in preparation of a proposal submitted in response to this RFQQ, in conduct of a presentation, or any other activities related to responding to this RFQQ.

B.15. NO OBLIGATION TO AWARD

This RFQQ does not obligate the State of Washington or OSPI to contract for services specified herein. This RFQQ will not result in a contract with OSPI. Instead, OSPI will publish a vetted list of academic screening tools for school districts to access. OSPI also reserves the right to cancel or to reissue the RFQQ in whole or in part without penalty.

B.16. REJECTION OF PROPOSALS

OSPI reserves the right at its sole discretion to reject any and all proposals received without penalty.

Section C. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

C.1. PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

Proposals must be formatted to print on eight and one-half by eleven (8 1/2 x 11) inch paper size with individual sections clearly identified. The Letter of Submittal, excluding the signed *Certifications and Assurances* and *Contractor Intake Form*, shall be a maximum of one (1) page. The four (4) major sections of the proposal are to be submitted in the order noted below:

1. Letter of Submittal including signed certifications, as applicable
2. Management Proposal

Proposals must provide information in the same order as presented in this document with the same headings. This will not only be helpful to the evaluators of the proposal, but should assist the Consultant in preparing a thorough response.

C.2. LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

The Letter of Submittal and applicable certifications must be signed and dated by a person authorized to legally bind the Consultant to a contractual relationship, (e.g., the President or Executive Director if a corporation, the managing partner if a partnership, or the proprietor if a sole proprietorship).

C.3. MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL

C.3.i. Project Management

Project Team Structure/Internal Controls – Provide a description of the proposed project team structure and internal controls to be used during the course of the project, including any subcontractors. Provide an organizational chart of your firm indicating lines of authority for personnel involved in performance of this potential contract and relationships of this staff to other programs or functions of the firm. This chart must also show lines of authority to the next senior level of management. Include who within the firm will have prime responsibility and final authority for the work.

Staff Qualifications/Experience – Identify staff, including subcontractors, who will be assigned to the potential contract, indicating the responsibilities and qualifications of such personnel, and include the amount of time each will be assigned to the project. Provide résumés for the named staff, which include information on the individual's particular skills related to this project, education, experience, significant accomplishments, and any other pertinent information. The Consultant must commit that staff identified in its proposal will

actually perform the assigned work. Any staff substitution must have the prior approval of OSPI.

C.3.ii. Experience of the Consultant

Relevant Experience – Describe how the Consultant meets the minimum qualifications and, if applicable, the desired qualifications. Include other relevant experience that indicates the qualifications of the Consultant, and any subcontractors, for the performance of the potential contract. Bidder shall also affirm minimum qualifications on the *Qualifications Assurances and Certification Form*.

Related Contracts – Include a list of contracts the Consultant has had during the last five (5) years that relate to the Consultant's ability to perform the services needed under this RFQQ. List contract reference numbers, contract period of performance, contact persons, telephone numbers, and fax numbers/e-mail addresses.

C.3.iii. References

List names, addresses, telephone numbers, and fax numbers/email addresses of three (3) business references for whom work has been accomplished and briefly describe the type of service provided for them. By submitting a proposal in response to this RFQQ, the Consultant and team members grant permission to OSPI to contact these references and others who, from OSPI's perspective, may have pertinent information. OSPI may or may not, at OSPI's discretion, contact these references or others. Do not include current OSPI staff as references.

C.3.iv. Past Performance

Provide information regarding past performance by indicating if the Consultant has received notification of contract breach in the past five (5) years. This does not lead to automatic disqualification. However, OSPI reserves the right to disqualify Consultant proposals based on the Consultant's historical performance, as outlined above in Section B. General Information for Consultants, 11. Responsiveness.

C.4. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

C.4.i. Description of Proposed Screening Tool

Provide information regarding the content of the screener reflective of what is being measured. Include any research base that supports this assessment as a screener.

With the description, include applicable data to provide the details about the norming for students in grades K-2 and sample size for validating the screening tool, categorization of

scoring (tier based, rubric, skill breakdown) and what definition is used for "cut-score" or "at-risk", data representation with examples, and if applicable decision making protocols if more than one screener is used to assess skills. Is professional development offered? If yes, does the information provide details for organizations and school districts to make decisions and/or purchase resources.

C.4.ii. Bias and Sensitivity of Proposed Screening Tool

Provide quantitative data about the screening tool assessment's rate of sensitivity, along with confidence intervals and specificity by student groups highlighted in the table on page 8 of RFQQ. Provide false positive and false negative quantitative data rates disaggregated by student groups highlighted in the table on page 8 of RFQQ. Provide analysis(s) used to evaluate that the screening tool is not biased against the student groups highlighted in the table on page 8 of RFQQ encompassing Item-Level and Test-Level Bias Analysis.

C.4.iii. Validity and Reliability of Proposed Screening Tool

Provide the validity reports of the screening tool including content, substantive, and consequential validity. Also include the site, state, or regions of the collected validity data. Provide at least two levels of reliability and the consistency of scoring including details of internal consistency for non-computer adaptive screening tools, test-retest intervals and scores.

C.4.iv. Correlation and Alignment to WA State Standards and Assessments

Provide details of how the proposed screening tool is aligned to Washington Standards in English Language Arts, WAKiDS, and Smarter Balanced Assessment. If applicable, provide quantitative correlations of data.

C.4.v. Capacity to Support WA State School Districts

Provide details about the intended age range for the screening tools. Share how the norming sample is similar to the student population (see Page 7 of the RFQQ), the scoring and range is reasonable for WA School Districts. And how does your project management can meet the diverse needs of Washington Districts and Schools with student enrollment ranging from 7 to 51,000 students.

C.5. COST PROPOSAL

The evaluation process is designed to award this procurement not necessarily to the Consultant of least cost, but rather to the Consultant whose proposal best meets the requirements of this RFQQ. However, Consultants are encouraged to submit proposals that are consistent with state government efforts to conserve state resources.

C.5.i. Identification of Costs

Identify all costs including expenses to be charged for performing the services necessary to accomplish the objectives of the Contract. The Consultant is to submit a fully detailed budget including staff costs, administrative costs, travel costs, and any other expenses necessary to accomplish the tasks and to produce the deliverables under the Contract. Consultants are required to collect and pay Washington State sales tax, if applicable.

C.5.ii. Travel Costs

If the Consultant's proposal includes any travel-related expenses as a line item, they are to be broken out separately. Any applicable mileage, meals, lodging, or other travel-related expenses, will be reimbursed in accordance with [Washington State travel regulations](#) established by the Office of Financial Management.

C.5.iii. Subcontractor Costs

Costs for subcontractors are to be broken out separately. Please note if any subcontractors are certified by the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises.

C.5.iv. Indirect Costs

Per OSPI's indirect costs policy, the maximum amount that may be charged or included in grants and contracts is the following:

Entity	State Grants and Contracts	Federal Grants and Contracts
School Districts	State recovery rate	Federal indirect rates, per OSPI's agreement with the U.S. Department of Education
Educational Service Districts	Per annual letter of agreement by K-12 Financial Resources Division	Per annual letter of agreement by K-12 Financial Resources Division
All other entities (including higher education, non-profits, independent consultants, etc.)	10%	10%

Section D. EVALUATION AND AWARD

D.1. EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Responsive proposals will be evaluated strictly in accordance with the requirements stated in this RFQQ and any addenda issued. The evaluation of proposals shall be accomplished by an evaluation team, to be designated by OSPI, which will determine the ranking of the proposals.

D.2. EVALUATION WEIGHTING AND SCORING

The following points will be assigned to the proposals for evaluation purposes:

Section No.	Section	Maximum Score
1	Presentation	20
2	Quality of the Assessment of Proposed Screening Tools	20
3	Bias and Sensitivity of Proposed Screening Tools	20
4	Validity and Reliability of Proposed Screening Tools	20
5	Correlation and Alignment to Washington State Learning Standards and Assessments	20
6	Capacity to support Washington State School Districts	20
7	Vendor and Staff Qualifications/Experience	20
8	Cost Proposal	20
9	Management Proposal (Project Team Structure/Internal Controls)	20
GRAND TOTAL FOR PRESENTATION AND PROPOSAL		180
Reference Checks (if required by OSPI)		10
Total Points Possible		190

D.3. REFERENCE CHECKS

References may be contacted for the top-scoring Bidder(s) only and will then be scored and added to the total score.

D.4. SELECTION OF APPARENT SUCCESSFUL BIDDER

OSPI reserves the right to award the contract to the Bidder whose proposal is deemed to be in the best interest of and most advantageous to OSPI and the state of Washington. The selected bidder will be declared the Apparent Successful Bidder (ASB).

The date of announcement of the ASB will be the date the announcement is emailed. The State will publish a vetted list of academic screening tools for school districts to access. Districts may choose to contact vendors to enter into contract directly.

D.5. NOTIFICATION TO BIDDERS

Proposals that have not been selected for further negotiation or award will be notified via email by the RFQQ Coordinator.

D.6. DEBRIEFING OF UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS

At the Bidder's request, an individual debriefing conference will be scheduled with an unsuccessful Bidder. The request for a debriefing conference must be received by the RFQQ Coordinator within three (3) business days following announcement of the ASB. The debriefing must be held within three (3) business days of the request, unless otherwise agreed upon by OSPI and Bidder.

Discussion will be limited to a critique of the requesting Bidder's proposal. Comparisons between proposals or evaluations of the other proposals will not be allowed. Debriefing conferences may be conducted in person or on the telephone and will be scheduled for a maximum of one (1) hour.

Since debriefing conferences pertain to the formal evaluation process, Bidders who were disqualified as non-responsive and therefore did not go through the formal evaluation process, are not entitled to a debriefing conference.

D.7. PROTEST PROCEDURE

This protest procedure is available to Bidders who submitted a response to this RFQQ document and who have participated in a debriefing conference. Upon completion of the debriefing conference, the Consultant is allowed five (5) business days to file a protest of the procurement with the RFQQ Coordinator. Protests shall be submitted to the RFQQ Coordinator via email.

Consultants protesting this procurement shall follow the procedures described below. Protests that do not follow these procedures shall not be considered. This protest procedure constitutes the sole administrative remedy available to Bidders under this procurement.

The protest must state:

1. The RFQQ number.
2. The grounds for the protest including specific facts and complete statements of the action(s) being protested. The protesting party may submit with the protest any documents or information deemed relevant.
3. A description of the relief or corrective action being requested should also be included.

Only protests stipulating an issue of fact concerning the following subjects shall be considered:

- A matter of bias, discrimination or conflict of interest on the part of the evaluator/evaluation team;
- Errors in computing the score; and/or
- Non-compliance with procedures described in the procurement document or OSPI policy.

Protests not based on procedural matters will not be considered. Protests will be rejected as without merit if they address issues such as: 1) an evaluator's professional judgment on the quality of a proposal, 2) OSPI's assessment of its own and/or other agencies needs or requirements, or 3) a complaint raised during the Complaint Procedure.

Upon receipt of a protest, a protest review will be held by OSPI.

1. The agency will assign a Protest Officer who had no involvement in the evaluation and award process to investigate and respond to the protest.
2. The Protest Officer will consider the available facts and issue a written response to the Bidder within ten (10) business days after receipt of the protest, unless additional time is needed. OSPI will notify the protesting bidder in writing if additional time is needed.
3. A copy of the protest and the agency's written decision will be provided to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Director of DES.

In the event a protest may affect the interest of another Bidder that submitted a proposal, such Bidder will be given an opportunity to submit its views and any relevant information on the protest to the Protest Officer.

The final determination of the protest shall either:

- Find the protest lacking in merit and uphold OSPI's action; or
- Find only technical or harmless errors in OSPI's procurement process and determine OSPI to be in substantial compliance and reject the protest; or
- Find merit in the protest and provide OSPI options which may include:
 - Correct the errors and re-evaluate all proposals, and/or
 - Reissue the RFQQ document and begin a new process, or
 - Make other findings and determine other courses of action as appropriate.

If OSPI determines that the protest is without merit, OSPI will enter into a contract with the Apparent Successful Bidder, assuming the parties reach agreement on the contract's terms. If the protest is determined to have merit, one of the alternatives noted in the preceding paragraph will be taken. All decisions made by OSPI relating to the protest shall be final.

Section E. RFQQ EXHIBITS

Exhibit A Certifications and Assurances

Exhibit B Qualification Affirmations

Exhibit C Proposal Checklist

EXHIBIT A

CERTIFICATION AND ASSURANCES

Bidder must sign and include the full text of this Exhibit A with their proposal.

Bidder makes the following certifications and assurances as a required element of the proposal to which it is attached, understanding that the truthfulness of the facts affirmed here and the continuing compliance with these requirements are conditions precedent to the award or continuation of the related contract(s):

1. Bidder declares that all answers and statements made in the proposal are true and correct.
2. The prices and/or cost data have been determined independently, without consultation, communication, or agreement with others for the purpose of restricting competition. However, Bidder may freely join with other persons or organizations for the purpose of presenting a single proposal.
3. The attached proposal is a firm offer for a period of ninety (90) business days following receipt, and it may be accepted by OSPI without further negotiation (except where obviously required by lack of certainty in key terms) at any time within the ninety (90) business-day period.
4. In preparing this proposal, Bidder has not been assisted by any current or former employee of the state of Washington whose duties relate (or did relate) to this proposal, and who was assisting in other than his or her official, public capacity. (Any exceptions to these assurances are described in full detail on a separate page and attached to this document.)
5. Bidder understands that OSPI will not reimburse Bidder for any costs incurred in the preparation of this proposal. All proposals become the property of OSPI, and Bidder claims no proprietary right to the ideas, writings, items, or samples, unless so stated in this proposal.
6. Unless otherwise required by law, the prices and/or cost data which have been submitted have not been knowingly disclosed by the Bidder and will not knowingly be disclosed by Bidder prior to opening, directly or indirectly, to any other Bidder or to any competitor.
7. Bidder agrees that submission of the attached proposal constitutes acceptance of the solicitation contents and the attached sample contract and general terms and conditions. If there are any exceptions to these terms, Bidder has described those exceptions in detail on a page attached to this document.
8. No attempt has been made or will be made by the Bidder to induce any other person or firm to submit or not to submit a proposal for the purpose of restricting competition.

9. Bidder grants OSPI the right to contact references and others, who may have pertinent information regarding the Bidder's prior experience and ability to perform the services contemplated in this procurement.
10. Bidder acknowledges that if awarded a contract with OSPI, Bidder is required to comply with all applicable state and federal civil rights and other laws. Failure to comply may result in Contract termination. Bidder agrees to submit additional information about its nondiscrimination policies, at any time, if requested by OSPI.
11. Bidder certifies that Bidder has not, within the three-year period immediately preceding the date of release of this competitive solicitation, been determined by a final and binding citation and notice of assessment issued by the Department of Labor and Industries or through a civil judgment to have willfully violated state minimum wage laws (RCW 49.38.082; Chapters 49.46 RCW, 49.48 RCW, or 49.52 RCW).
12. Bidder has not been debarred or otherwise restricted from participating in any public contracts.
13. Bidder certifies that Bidder has not willfully violated Washington State's wage payment laws within the last three years.
14. Bidder acknowledges its obligation to notify OSPI of any changes in the certifications and assurances above.

I certify under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature of Bidder

Date

Place Signed (City, State)

Print Name

Title

Organization Name

EXHIBIT B

QUALIFICATION AFFIRMATIONS

CONSULTANT INFORMATION	
Bidder:	

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS	
<i>Please check all boxes that apply.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Licensed to do business in the State of Washington. If not licensed, provide a written intent to become licensed in Washington within thirty (30) calendar days of being selected as the Apparently Successful Contractor.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge of foundational reading and rapid automatized naming (must comprise all four criteria: colors, numbers, letters, and familiar objects) skills for Washington State implementation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Have the capacity to support multiple districts at one time without diminishing the implementation process or fidelity of the tool.	

Consultants who do not meet the minimum qualifications noted above will be rejected as non-responsive and will not receive further consideration. Any proposal that is rejected as non-responsive will not be evaluated or scored.

ADDITIONAL DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS	
<i>Please check all boxes that apply.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Ability to work with diverse educators, classified staff, and administrators to ensure successful implementation of the screener/tool.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Ability to work with diverse sized districts from very small (twelve (12) students) to very large (fifty thousand (50,000) students).	
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience in working with diverse districts including urban, suburban, and rural communities.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience working with diverse student populations as described on page 9 of this RFQQ.	

I certify under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature of Bidder

Date

Place Signed (City, State)

Print Name

Title

Organization Name

EXHIBIT C

PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

Please use the checklist below to ensure that you have submitted all required materials in the required format. This checklist does not need to be submitted with your proposal.

Included in Proposal	Component
<input type="checkbox"/>	Letter of Submittal
<input type="checkbox"/>	Management Proposal
<input type="checkbox"/>	Technical Proposal
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cost Proposal
<input type="checkbox"/>	References
<input type="checkbox"/>	Certifications and Assurances
<input type="checkbox"/>	Qualification Affirmations
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contractor Intake Form Download an editable version from OSPI's website
<input type="checkbox"/>	Washington State Business License, if applicable (see Contractor Intake Form) For more information about this, visit the Department of Revenue website.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Business Enterprise Certification Form, if applicable (see Contractor Intake Form) For more information about certification, visit the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises website or Department of Veterans Affairs website .