

# Request for Proposals No. 2025-27

## Addendum 02 – Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the question and answer period of RFP No. 2025-27, issued March 16, 2025.

Separately, OSPI is also releasing Amendment 01, which documents changes to Scope of Work and Funding. Perspective bidders should refer to Amendment 01 for additional information.

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:** The RFP (p. 8) states that OSPI requests evaluation of alignment of the states' general and alternate **assessments with** the revised State Learning **Standards**. Federal peer review expects a comparison of test items/forms with standards. However, the RFP (p. 16) states that "Access to test items is not anticipated to accomplish the objectives of this RFP." Could OSPI clarify which units of comparison are to be included in the analysis?

Is the intent to evaluate the alignment between the assessment *frameworks* and the new standards? For example:

**Smarter Balanced:** Is OSPI looking for a comparison of the revised standards with the corresponding test blueprints, claims, and assessment targets (p. 12) to evaluate the extent to which the existing test design supports the potential for alignment with the revised standards?

**Answer:** Yes. OSPI will assume the alignment between test items/forms remain in alignment with the corresponding test blueprints, claims, and assessment targets. It is the alignment between test blueprint, claims, and assessment targets where the impact of revised standards should appear.

**WA-AIM:** Is OSPI looking for a comparison of the revised standards with the Access Point Frameworks to evaluate the extent to which Access Points, derived from the previous content standards, link to the revised standards?

**Answer:** Yes



2. **Question:** Addendum 01, Answer to Question 8 states that “Part of the work will feed into our technical documentation for Federal Peer review.” Federal peer review, in its current form, has expectations for specific types of evidence. Could OSPI specify which Critical Elements the state expects to address with the results of this work?

**Answer:** We anticipate using this study, or components of this study, as potential evidence for Critical Elements 2.1 (alignment of the test blueprints to the depth and breadth of the revised learning standards) and 3.1 (same evidence as 2.1).

3. **Question:** RFP p. 29 fifth bullet states “Under what conditions can our assessments within the scope of this project be used to assess the revised learning standards?” Could OSPI clarify what is meant by “conditions?” For example, does this refer to test design conditions (i.e., If the blueprint were adjusted so that [xyz], then the assessment could be used to assess the revised learning standards.)? Or does this refer to the revisions that would need to be made to current assessments? (Or something else?)

**Answer:** This refers to the test design conditions, and the example stated, “If the blueprint were adjusted so that [xyz], then the assessment could be used to assess the revised learning standards.”

4. **Question:** 4. RFP p. 29 states that the Alignment Study Technical Report should report on “to what extent the knowledge and skills identified in the revised Washington State K–12 Learning Standards in ELA and mathematics are reflected in the English Language Proficiency expectations.” ELP standards are generally NOT expected to include knowledge, skills, or vocabulary from a state’s academic content standards (this is true for federal peer review also). Instead, the content standards are understood to be the referent and the ELP standards are expected to support ELs in successful engagement with the content standards (have a “correspondence” relationship with the content standards).

Can OSPI clarify if the intent of this statement is to report on the extent to which the ELP standards reflect the academic language needed by English Learners (ELs) to meaningfully engage in learning as defined by Washington’s academic content standards for each subject area?

**Answer:** OSPI wants to know if the ELP standards fit within the revised learning standards. We want to ensure that our ELP assessments are not asking students about content or academic language that is not within the revised ELA and math standards. Since the intent of the RFP is to see how the PLDs align to the revised state learning standards, the expectation is that the PLDs support access to the K–12 learning standards. In other words, we are looking for alignment with the language needed to support access to the learning standards.

5. **Question:** In the RFP p. 14 A.5.i., one bullet requests recommendations for blueprint adjustments and another bullet requests recommendations for item development. Could OSPI elaborate on the level of detail and the types of information that would be useful to the state as relates to blueprint adjustments and item development? For example, is the extent of the information needed limited to summary / categorical findings such as adjustments to proportions of items on blueprints or number of items needed for development? Or does OSPI need detailed information, for example, suggestions for new research-based item types as relates to the new/adjusted standards, specifications for statistical and content characteristics of new items, etc?

**Answer:** We are looking for summary/categorical findings such as adjustments to proportions of items on blueprints, where and how much item development is needed based on current assessment blueprints, claims and assessment targets. And/or where the study might recommend deeper revisions to current blueprints, claims, and assessment targets.

6. **Question:** The RFP indicates the following determination as the objective for this study: Identifying to what extent can “the existing in scope WCAP assessments be used to assess the depth and breadth of the revised 2024 Washington K-12 State Learning Standards in ELA and mathematics.” Are there any existing alignment study reports for the in-scope state assessments? If yes, we request the State specifies for which assessments.

**Answer:** OSPI has previous alignment studies for WCAS, WA-AIM, and can obtain access for the Smarter Balanced assessments in ELA and math.

7. **Question:** The RFP states “Access to test items is not anticipated to accomplish the objective of this RFP.” To help determine an alignment approach that best meets the State’s needs, we request clarity on the role of test items in the alignment study. Does the statement above indicate that an item-to-standards alignment by itself is insufficient to meet the State’s needs, or rather that the proposed study need not include item-to-standards alignment as a component?

**Answer:** The proposed alignment study does not need to include an item-to-standards component. Previous alignment studies show sufficient alignment of current items to test blueprints, assessment targets, and/or reporting categories to standards. It is the alignment of test blueprints, assessment targets, and/or reporting categories to standards that will help OSPI determine where future item development may need to occur.

8. **Question:** The RFP states there is a file size limit of 35 MB, sharing that “Proposals that exceed file size limits may be submitted via OneDrive.” Should it be necessary, can the State please confirm if sharing the files via a shared Box link would be sufficient? If OneDrive is the preferred option, please confirm if bidders could request an upload link to the State’s OneDrive workspace to upload the proposal and related components.

**Answer:** Box is not a standard option. For file sizes that exceed 35MB, Bidders may email the RFP Coordinator to request a link to a unique secure OSPI OneDrive. Bidders should email the RFP Coordinator once all documents have been uploaded. Proposals not received by the deadline will not be reviewed. Reminder: OSPI does not assume responsibility for any problems with the electronic delivery of materials, unless it is determined that OSPI's email system or server was at fault.

9. **Question:** The RFP indicates that the Letter of Submittal should include a References attachment (p. 27). The Management Proposal, section C.5.iii., requests business references (p. 31). Can the State please clarify the intended nature of the References attachment within the Letter of Submittal and how it should differ from the business references requested in the Management Proposal section C.5.iii? For example, is the Letter of Submittal References attachment intended to be related to the business references list provided later in the proposal? Or, for example, is the intention for this section for the Bidder to provide a list of sources referenced within the proposal text?

**Answer:** The three business references requested in section C.5.iii are the same requested references to be attached to the Letter of Submittal. Bidders may use the provided checklist, Exhibit Q, to ensure all components are included.

10. **Question:** The RFP contains details surrounding the Contractor's obligation to adhere to the [Washington State Travel Regulations](#). Will the awarded Contractor be required to submit the employee [Travel Expense Voucher](#) for travel related to committees as a part of compliance with the State's travel policies?

**Answer:** No. The awarded Contractor will be required to submit detailed invoices to the OSPI Contract Manager for payment. For see Exhibit L: Sample Contract for invoice requirements. The State Administrative and Accounting Manual Travel section is provided to assist bidders with preparing a detailed budget identifying all costs where travel costs estimates adhere to the Washington State Travel Regulations.

11. **Question:** The RFP indicates "The activities required to accomplish the primary objective will involve input from educators and/or subject matter experts who systematically gather judgments about selected dimensions of revised K–12 Learning Standards in ELA and Mathematics, to various components of current assessments." Does the State have a preference for the use of educators or subject matter experts in the fulfillment of this work?

**Answer:** OSPI does not have a preference.

12. **Question:** Is OSPI willing to consider a proposal that presents more than one option for how the project could be completed?

**Answer:** Yes.

13. **Question:** Given that some portion of this work is Federally funded, how might any new Executive Orders issued in 2025 might impact the way this work is performed?  
**Answer:** Any contract award is contingent upon the availability of funding. This work to determine the alignment of our standards aligns with our laws and values. OSPI will continue to review any new Executive Orders for any violations of our State Constitution or our state laws. Additional information can be found in the OSPI January 29, 2025 news release, [\*State Superintendent Chris Reykdal's Statement on President Trump's Illegal Plans to Withhold Funds from Washington State\*](#).
14. **Question:** Can OSPI clarify if the 15% federal subsidy is conflated with the total funding, and hence all funding is subject to federal grant rules, or can 15% of the federal funding be earmarked and only that 15% subject to federal grant rules?  
**Answer:** If any portion of an awarded contract is federally funded, the selected contractor must therefore comply with all Federal Grant Terms and Conditions.
15. **Question:** We assume that there isn't any reason (e.g. policy, rule, statute) which would prohibit a vendor from being awarded the work under this RFP, and bidding on any future RFP to be the WCAP development and administration provider. Is this correct? If not, please explain.  
**Answer:** There is no policy, rule, or statute prohibiting a vendor from being awarded work under this RFP and bidding on any future RFPs to be the WCAP development and administration provider. However, if the Bidder, or any of the Bidder's business partners, directors, officers, managers, employees, or board members are current or former (within the last 24 months) officers or employees of the State of Washington, you may need to seek guidance from the [Executive Ethics Board](#) before a contract is offered.
16. **Question:** On page 16, the RFP states that "all documents, videos, audio records, presentations, or other deliverables required under the resulting Contract shall be produced in format, compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act and follow the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG 2.0), OSPI's formatting standard specified in Exhibit I." Does this apply to final deliverables only or do draft deliverables need to be ADA and WCAG compliant?  
**Answer:** Yes, all documents and presentations should be created and delivered to OSPI ADA and WCAG compliant.
17. **Question:** States often have a list of former and current educators who are available to support standards and alignment work. Will OSPI provide a list of educators to work on this alignment study?  
**Answer:** Yes, OSPI will work collaboratively with Contractor to identify committee members from available WA educators.

**18. Question:** Section B.7.i. on Confidential Documents, pg. 22. This section stipulates certain requirements that bidders need to follow *'If OSPI requests confidential or proprietary information ...'* How will bidders know whether OSPI requests confidential or proprietary information? Will this be announced generally? Or does this section mean that, if bidder's responses to the proposal happen to include confidential or proprietary information, bidders need to mark that information as such?

**Answer:** For the purpose of this RFP, there is no confidential or proprietary information requested or required. Therefore, do not include any confidential or proprietary information. If OSPI requests confidential or proprietary information as part of the evaluation and interview process, bidders will be notified. For confidential or proprietary information, bidders must clearly print the word "Confidential" on the lower right-hand corner of each page containing the confidential or proprietary information.

**19. Question** RE Pg. 27 & 31: On page 27, the RFP requests a Letter of Submittal, including the following attachments: Exhibit K, Exhibit N, Exhibit O, Exhibit P, and References. Additionally, on page 31, Section C.5.iii. of the Management Proposal also requests References.

Could you please confirm whether the three business references should be included in both sections? If not, please clarify which section should contain the References.

**Answer:** The three business references can be attached to the Letter of Submittal and/or included in the Management Proposal. References must clearly be identified by an included heading. Evaluators will receive the complete Bidder's submission and will score proposals accordingly.

**20. Question** RE Section A.5.ii, Pg. 15: The RFP calls for the involvement of educators and/or subject matter experts as well as National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) members. Should the proposal budget include honorariums for educators and/or the subject matter experts and NTAC members?

**Answer:** Yes, compensation for educator involvement and/or subject matter experts should be included in Bidder's cost proposal in accordance with [RCW 28A.300.802](#), Advisory groups – Travel – Compensation. No compensation for NTAC members or OSPI staff involvement should be included.

**21. Question** Section A.8., Pg. 18: If the federal funds planned for this project become unavailable, does the Washington OSPI plan to alter the scope of work for this project during the contract term as a result? If so, what would any alterations to the work involve?

**Answer:** The RFP 2025-27 funding is the maximum budgeted for this project, inclusive of federal funds. Bidders are encouraged to provide their most favorable and competitive cost estimate to perform the work. Any reductions to scope will be negotiated with the Apparent Successful Bidder prior to executing a contract contingent upon the availability of funding at the time.

22. **Question:** My colleagues and I read about the RFP No. 2025-27 regarding alignment study, and are thinking if we are eligible to bid for the contract? Please note that our center has not conducted large-scale alignment study yet, but we have experienced faculty and advanced doctoral students who will work on the study if funded. However, before we submit our proposal, we wonder if OSPI is open to new vendors like us, or if OSPI prefers established vendors who have conducted similar studies for state assessments?

**Answer:** One of the minimum qualifications is "Experience with large-scale assessment, and associated knowledge of best practices in the field of test measurement," so if your center has not yet completed a large-scale assessment, your proposal would be considered non-responsive to the minimum qualifications, and would not be evaluated.