Request for Proposals No. 2026-12 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 December 9, 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:** Given the emphasis on projections and better use of data, is OSPI open to AI/ML-based capabilities (for forecasting, anomaly detection, or scenario modeling), and are there any specific governance or review requirements for those components? Reference: RFP, p. 11 (SASQUATCH Key Objectives – Projections, Better Data/Decisions).
   Answer: Consider OSPI to be cautiously interested. One can imagine, for example, providing an AI tool to find insights within or forecasting using reported data. But in the data collection, calculation, and data reporting processes, we must proceed very thoughtfully to ensure accuracy, traceability, and predictability, and to conform with guidance provided by WaTech and the Washington State Legislature.

2. **Question:** Is there a glossary or appendix of the individual systems within the current state model?
   Answer:

   [Budget](#)
   - F-195: Annual Budget Document for local education agencies
   - F-195F: Four Year Budget Projection for local education agencies
   - F-200: Budget Extension (Revision) Document for local education agencies

   [Personnel](#)
   - S-275 – Annual Report of All Certificated and Classified Employees in Local Education Agencies

   [Enrollment](#)
   - P-223 - Monthly Report of Enrollment Eligible for Basic Support
   - P-223RS - Monthly Report of Running Start Enrollment
   - P-223-1418 -Monthly Report of Open Doors (OD) Program Eligible Enrollment
   - P-223TC - Monthly Report of Technical College Enrollment Eligible for Basic Education Support

Washington Office of Superintendent of **PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

- P-240 - Attendance Report of Ancillary Services to Part-Time Students Eligible for Basic Support
- P-223S - Nonstandard School Year AAFTE Enrollment Eligible for Basic Support
- P-223H - Monthly Report of Special Education Enrollment
- E-525 - Report of Final Home and Hospital (HH) Services
- P-213 - Report of Students Residing in Nonhigh Districts and Enrolled in High Districts
- UW/WYA - Reporting for other unique entities providing basic education services

Calculation Hub

- F-203: Estimation tool used for funding during the budget process to approximate apportionment system calculations for local education agencies.
- Apportionment System- The primary calculation system for formula driven state funding for local education agencies.

Financial Reporting

- F-196 – Annual Financial Statements for local education agencies
- F-197 – Monthly Treasurers Report for School Districts
- F-185 – Annual Financial Statements for Educational Service Districts

Levy /Local Effort Assistance

- F-780 – Annual Report of Levy Authority and Local Effort Assistance Funding

3. **Question:** Why the change in implementation schedule from 3 to 2 years from the previous bid?
Answer: With a contract start date of July 1, 2026, OSPI is interested in having development completed, and portions of the new system released for the 2027-28 school year and all other portions of the system available for use in the 2028-29 school year. During the 2028-29 school year through June 2029, OSPI does anticipate there will be some corrections, enhancements, and other changes necessary, but these would be similar to the changes, corrections and enhancements that may be required every year based on legislative changes or agency needs.

4. **Question:** For the additional collaboration costs and staffing we're asked to describe if other vendors are awarded remaining Work Sections, should those costs be included in the evaluated total cost, or treated as informational and excluded from the scoring calculations? Reference: RFP, pp. 24 (multi-vendor scenarios), 45 (collaboration cost section).
Answer: Collaboration costs should be identified in the appropriate line of the Attachment D: Cost Proposal Breakdown Workbook. Total project implementation costs will be considered when evaluating proposals to ensure a comprehensive review of project details. Collaboration costs are intended to provide clarity in additional costs to be expected when multiple vendors must work together. However, if a bidder is awarded

more than one work section, additional collaboration would not be necessary for work in the awarded sections, and the collaboration costs identified for those work sections would not be awarded as part of the total contract.

5. **Question:** Do you have any quantifiable outcomes or results? Cycle time, personnel costs, quality of reports?
   Answer: If you are asking about the development cycle, the successful bidder will be expected to adhere to accepted Agile/Scrum and Project Management Professional practices.
   If, instead, you are asking about the project goals, these can be found at a high level on Page 11 of the RFP. Specific measures for each will be developed in the discovery phase.

6. **Question:** Do your legacy reports include pixel perfect reporting, including pagination, etc. and if so, are you expecting pixel perfect/paginated reports in Sasquatch?
   Answer: OSPI expects many of the reports that will be created from SASQUATCH to be available for printing in a high quality, professional format. Examples include the budget and financial reports that are required by state law and regulation in the format dictated by the State Auditor's Office and OSPI. At the same time, OSPI expects that new ad-hoc reporting functionality in SASQUATCH will eliminate the need for many of the reports currently distributed in PDF format.

7. **Question:** The information collected in these forms is at an aggregate level (e.g., student count at a school and grade level). Do you not have access to student level data or are there any restrictions (law/processes) that prohibits you from collecting and using student level data for the calculations?
   Answer: OSPI has access to student level data, but that data does not include all of the elements required for purposes of funding calculations. There are no statutory barriers to using our existing student level data, but use of that data may require additional changes to other systems and have unintended consequences to district users/ data submitters. OSPI is interested in exploring efficiencies in data collection as part of the transition to SASQUATCH.

8. **Question:** Can you elaborate on the "misalignment of future state objectives" from the last RFP?
   Answer: OSPI received many excellent proposals during the previous RFPs. However, the previous RFP was interpreted heavily toward Data Calculation, and many proposals did not clearly articulate the requirements for data collection and reporting in a way that produced comprehensive proposals. We believe this impacted Bidder's ability to provide balanced proposals identifying solutions for all the business requirements of this project.

9. **Question:** From your perspective, what are the biggest challenges you anticipate in training school districts, ESDs, and charter/tribal schools on SASQUATCH?
   Answer: Entities served by SASQUATCH utilize a variety of Student Information Systems (SIS) to track and manage program requirements. It's worth noting that the majority of districts have chosen to use a third-party tool provided by WSIPC for submitting their data to us.
   Training opportunities currently in place (e.g., annual user-manual updates, region or district visits, and updates via email) may be sufficient for relaying the bulk of the information that will affect external users
   Nevertheless, we welcome suggestions for further tools and approaches for sharing information that minimizes the impact on each entity.

10. **Question:** Is OSPI open to the use of new tools, such as Microsoft Power BI, as part of the proposed solution, and if so, how would you like bidders to address any additional licensing needs in our proposals, particularly if OSPI does not currently own those licenses?
    Answer: OSPI is open to all proposed solutions that meet the requirements of this project, including the use of secondary tools. However, any additional tools or licensing required to implement a proposed solution must be identified in the proposal. You may assume that OSPI would need to purchase the new tools, licenses, including any training to develop staff competency, and all such costs should be identified in your proposal.

11. **Question:** Could you clarify your expectations for the demo? Are you primarily looking for a demo of our existing configurable platform Or do you expect more of a prototype / wireframe / walkthrough of the future SASQUATCH workflows, even if underlying functionality is not yet implemented?
    Answer: OSPI does not expect you to develop a final product for the demonstration portion of this RDP. Rather, please review the demonstration scenarios and consider the best way to present this information to OSPI. Demonstrations will be evaluated based on the information provided in Attachment C: Sasquatch Demonstration Scenarios.

12. **Question:** Organization Change Management (OCM) is requested on this project, but no specific framework is mentioned (e.g. Prosci ADKAR, Kotter). Are there specific OCM artifacts expected to maintain adoption, address resistance, and ensure consistent readiness across all groups?
    Answer: OSPI prefers you to provide OCM using the Prosci model. However, other OCM models clearly articulated would be acceptable if they address the OCM needs of the project.

13. **Question:** Are you Open for Customizable COTS solution?
    Answer: Yes, OSPI is not excluding any category of solution at this time and would consider a COTS solution if one was available to meet the business needs of the proposal.

14. **Question:** You mentioned including costs for licensing for tools proposed outside of what is in the RFP. Are we to include all licensing costs?
    Answer: Yes.

15. **Question:** How many proposals did you receive from previous RFPs?
    Answer: We received one responsive proposal from the first RFP attempt, and 9 responsive from the second.

16. **Question:** Do you feel comfortable with your current business processes?
    Answer: The processes are well known by our SMEs and generate the correct data, but only with a large amount of manual work and specialized knowledge on the part of our in-house staff.

17. **Question:** RE: Attachment A: SASQUATCH System Requirements – Data Reporting Sheet There are many cells in "Vendor Readiness Explanation" column of the Data Reporting sheet that will not allow us to enter a response, such as ID 001 BUD. When we attempt to enter a response, a popup message states: "The cell or chart you're trying to change is on a protected sheet. To make a change, unprotect the sheet." The sheet is password protected, preventing us from unprotecting the sheet. Please advise how we can respond to all rows in the Data Reporting sheet.
    Answer: This format and protection error in the file has been corrected, and an updated copy of the file has been posted to WEBS and OSPI's website. All cells in the "Vendor Readiness Explanation" column have been unlocked to allow your comments to be entered and saved. Thank you for calling out the issue.

18. **Question:** RE: Attachment A: SASQUATCH System Requirements – Data Reporting Sheet The "Vendor Readiness" column in the Data Reporting sheet does not have the same dropdown options (e.g. "out of the box," "configuration," et al) as the other sheets in the requirements file. Further, we cannot manually enter a response. When we attempt to respond, a popup message states: "The cell or chart you're trying to change is on a protected sheet. To make a change, unprotect the sheet." The sheet is password protected, preventing us from unprotecting the sheet. Please advise how we can respond to the "Vendor Readiness" column on the Data Reporting sheet.
    Answer: This validation and protection error in the file has been corrected, and an updated copy of the file has been posted to WEBS and OSPI's website. All cells in the "Vendor Readiness" column have been updated to allow you to select the appropriate dropdown options. Thank you for calling out the issue.

19. **Question:** RE: Attachment A: SASQUATCH System Requirements – Data Collection Sheet The "Requirement Description" cell for Requirement 137SAFS on the Data Collection Sheet is empty. Does the State wish to add a requirement?
Answer: Thank you for the catch. The requirement titled 137SAFS has been removed from the project requirements. This row has been updated to indicate that no response is required from prospective bidders.

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