Request for Proposals No. 2026-03
Addendum 01 – Pre-Bid Conference Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the Pre-Bid Conference, which was held on September 2, 2025.

All amendments, addenda, and notifications related to this procurement will be posted on the OSPI website (if this was an open procurement) and on the Washington Electronic Business Solution (WEBS) website. Additional questions concerning this procurement must be submitted to contracts@K12.wa.us. Communication directed to other parties will be considered unofficial and non-binding on OSPI, and may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

1. **Question:** This is just one grant opportunity, correct? There will not be multiple successful bidders?
   Answer: Yes, this is just for a single facilitator. It is different for the two prior IPTN RFPs, which were for multiple providers.

2. **Question:** Can you walk us through how we ended up with this RFP, some of the inclusive ed work done thus far, just share a snapshot.
   Answer: This is the next iteration of the Inclusionary Practices Project (IPP), a state-funded project to improve inclusionary practices in WA. We had some good success in this area, but noticed when we examined our data that there were pervasive opportunity gaps and lack of improvement in our data. This resulted in even greater gaps in inclusion for Black students with disabilities and students with IDD (compared with the rates of inclusion of other groups of students). That is now our priority in WA.

   We have been transitioning from the idea of a "project" building inclusionary practices to focusing on inclusionary outcomes. What are the efforts we need to see to transform our system so it works for everyone. We are now concentrating our efforts in transitioning to and building a statewide network. Before there was a cadre with individual orgs with their own audiences (this is somewhat still the case).

   This RFP is for a partner organization to act as a facilitator and support OSPI in designing, building, and implementing this statewide network so that it aligns with our vision and need for coordinated efforts. The role of facilitator has been evolving based on the network's needs. There is already a body of existing work, as we have had an organization help us from the beginning to facilitate the process for us to develop our

vision, build the infrastructure for this statewide network, and carry it forward. To do this, we think five years ahead about where we want to be, and then backwards plan – determining how to organize the network, how to support IPTN member organizations (providers of technical assistance and professional development) to align their work to our vision and aims, and so forth. Different activities for this are outlined in the RFP.

3. **Question:** Can you describe how the IPTN district participation is evolving with year three?

   Answer: For this year, we continue to have several different grant and funding opportunities. This is currently associated with Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5263 (E2SSB 5263).

   Our IPTN intensive districts have the highest levels of exclusion for the two student populations in our aim. We are putting additional parameters around that engagement this year. We're trying to prioritize sustainability across the larger network. Previously, we had fully funded IPTN member organizations; we're shifting now such that a majority of the funds will go to districts. Districts will then use those funds to partner w/ IPTN member orgs that provide technical assistance aligned with the IPTN's vision and priorities for inclusionary outcomes. That form package will be launched in the next couple weeks, and districts are already reaching out to our member organizations for those partnerships. Our funding for member organizations will be focused on those coordinated network activities – communities of practice, developing guidance alongside us.

   We have two other grant opportunities that are part of this larger inclusion work. We have districts identified with schools that are required to engage in school improvement activities. There is also a matching grant related to supporting districts engaging in Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS). In other words, we have broad district engagement, and many districts are really interested in engaging in IPTN work in partnership with us and our member organizations this year.

4. **Question:** Do you have any data that speaks to your "why" – why haven't you seen the same inclusionary outcomes across the state for Black students with disabilities and students with intellectual and developmental disabilities as you've seen with other student populations? With that information, we can better understand where the gaps are.

   Answer: First, there is a national body of research around the overidentification and segregation of these student populations in public education. So the "why" is that we have an educational system that wasn't designed with these students in mind in the first place. In our statewide data, we have seen that the students who were already mostly included in general education settings now are much more included. But we didn't see a shift in outcomes for students for students who were segregated and excluded from

general education settings for most or all of their school day. When we look at our data in WA, and we talk about exclusionary practices, we're not just talking about access to general education spaces. We're seeing that the student groups in our network's aim are also subjected to the highest rates of disciplinary removals, restraint and isolation, and removal from general education instruction in core content. So again, this suggests that we had an increase in inclusionary practices, but not in inclusionary outcomes. Without a wider transformation around how we're doing things in an MTSS framework, we won't see that larger transformation in school systems – including general education practices, structures, and culture – that we need to see. We've been having lots of conversations about the cultural shifts that are needed for this. This is part of why we are partnering with districts who are also engaged in school improvement work, helping districts engage in root cause analyses around why they are seeing disproportionality in their data across their schools, and so forth. Students continue to be marginalized when we use a patchwork or band-aid approach, rather than seeking larger system transformation and changing what "business as usual" looks like. That's the focus of the network.

5. **Question:** Are there opportunities to come on as a subcontractor?
   Answer: We do have another RFP launching for member organizations. These are the folks who are providing the TA in Washington. We also have different opportunities across our larger network, like our advisory group and collaborators. So, yes, beyond this opportunity related to IPTN facilitation, there are other opportunities.

6. **Question:** Is there someone I can send my capability statement to? How do I track available opportunities related to this work?
   Answer: Available competitive opportunities related to this work (and other OSPI projects) will be posted on the [OSPI website](#) and on the Washington Electronic Business Solution ([WEBS](#)) website. Vendors registered with WEBS receive automatic notification when an agency posts a procurement that aligns with the vendor's expertise, so registration is highly recommended. Capability statements in response to a particular RFP should be submitted to the RFP Coordinator listed in the procurement.

   For other, non-competitive, opportunities such as advisory group and collaborators, capability statements may be submitted to Cassie Martin at cassie.martin@K12.wa.us.

7. **Question:** I noticed in this RFP that there was language about bringing on additional people outside of this opportunity. Is that connected?
   Answer: There will be other opportunities in addition to this. This RFP is specific to facilitation. We will publish an RFP for member organizations to join this work. There are also potential opportunities to join the IPTN advisory or engage in other ways. You can reach out to Cassie Martin with questions about this.

8. **Question:** Reading thru the RFP – is there content already developed and you're looking for someone to facilitate and support, or are you looking for that to be developed?
Answer: This partner would help OSPI design and facilitate the larger network. We have existing infrastructure, but that is iterative and based on a 5-year plan.

9. **Question:** How is the restraint and isolation work going, and what's been your approach or experience to thinking about disproportionate discipline?
Answer: The RREI project [Reducing Restraint & Eliminating Isolation (RREI) Project](#) was modeled after the IPP. It is operated by the Student Engagement and Supports (SES) division at OSPI. There are several different pieces of this work, including demonstration sites, pilot sites, and a technical assistance manual which is still forthcoming. We are also partnering with SES to bring in one of their team members into our IPTN design team.

10. **Question:** So to clarify, the role of this vendor would be to sit with OSPI staff, help us identify the gaps, and understand the why?
Answer: We're already identified the gaps and the why. This is about how we design a network to improve outcomes and be strategic in how we operate as a larger network. This involves partnering around that strategy, messaging, engaging in continuous improvement around how the network works.

11. **Question:** So the why would be that there needs to be a mindset shift, go back to sit with educators, admins, etc to help them understand why we need to lean in?
Answer: This is more about how we would implement those efforts effectively. How do we engage that larger systems transformation?

    Yes, it would include partnering with OSPI and supporting us with the design of the network and network drivers and to help with the different facets of the network, like the advisory and partner districts.

12. **Question:** Looking at the member meetings, are they in-person, virtual, or hybrid?
Answer: We have done a combination in the past. Some of the work is easier when we are together. Meetings that we facilitate with the network are all online. If you are referring to the approximately 9 meetings/year, those meetings have all been done virtually in the past.

13. **Question:** Do you involve some of the actual individuals when you are gathering your information?
    Answer: Yes. We've had different focus groups. Our advisory comprises folks with lived experiences and family members. Last year one of our member organizations convened a youth council. There's been a lot of educator, family, and student involvement in interview data, social validity data, etc. We are always looking for new and different ways to involve students and families.

14. **Question:** Is there a specific type of evaluation that you're looking for?
    Answer: Not specifically, no. But we do really want to figure out and measure the effectiveness of the actual network. How do we know what makes an effective statewide network? This allows us to engage in continuous improvement with our facilitation and design. We are less interested in how busy we are, and more on whether we want to see the outcomes we want to see.

15. **Question:** So are you designing it here in the first year, and then implementing it after that?
    Answer: Part of it is an iterative process, so we do engage in continuous improvement, but this work is already underway, and there is no intention to pause already ongoing work for a design year.

16. **Question:** Is the $240k budget for the multiyear project, or for one year?
    Answer: The initial period of performance of the resulting contract is for one year: November 2025, through September 30, 2026. OSPI may amend to extend/renew the contract for three (3) additional contract years through Federal Fiscal Year 2027, 2028, & 2029, renewing on October 1, each year.

17. **Question:** How has it been in Washington given the current political climate? For example, have there been changes in what data related to race/ethnicity you can collect now? Has there been any pushback? Every state is handling this differently – can you speak to how you're handling it?
    Answer: We continue to stay on track. Even with recent notices about no longer reporting disproportionality data, Washington will still collect those data and continue our work around reducing (and someday eliminating) disproportionality. That's our goal and we're staying the course.

18. **Question:** The proposal states that 100% of funds for this project are federal dollars (page 14 of the RFP). How will you stay on track with the goals outlined in the RFP if federal funding changes?
    Answer: We have our IDEA funds for the current year. Also, this year and moving forward we have a state set-aside. This has been a priority for our statewide work and we will continue to prioritize it.

19. **Question:** Will this recording be available?
    Answer: We don't post the pre-bid conference recordings to the website. This written Q&A covers all questions asked and answers given during the pre-bid conference.

20. **Question:** How is the OSPI design team selected? What is the role of the IPTN facilitator in helping to select design team members (p. 10 of the RFP)?
    Answer: We look to have representation from across internal divisions. Since it is a statewide network, it can't be something that's solely led by special education. Folks are selected with areas of expertise, interest, and previous experience with technical assistance in inclusive education. The IPTN facilitator would be part of the design team, and would partner with OSPI to identify and recruit any additional design team members within OSPI.

No questions or responses included in this document require any changes to the solicitation document; this document stands alone.