

Request for Qualifications and Quotes

No. 2026-11

Addendum 02 – Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the question and answer period of RFQQ No. 2026-11, issued November 17, 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:** Does the \$90,000 maximum reflect the total budget of the project for three years or is it the budget for the first year, with additional funds added for year 2 and year 3?

Answer: This is the budget for the first year. There may be additional funds for contract extensions should OSPI decide to exercise renewal options, per RFQQ Section A.6.

2. **Question:** Can you confirm that, if selected, we would be considered a Contractor and not a Subrecipient/Subgrantee for federal reporting purposes?

Answer: The selected Apparent Successful Bidder (ASB) would be considered a Contractor.

3. **Question:** Do you intend to award this with a fixed priced billing schedule?

Answer: Per RFQQ Section C.5, Bidders shall include a cost proposal breakdown for this project. It cannot exceed \$90,000. The schedule of payments can be broken into multiple payments in connection with deliverable items. Bidders are encouraged to structure the Cost Proposal in a performance-based manner that identifies payment(s) tied to deliverables or work described in RFQQ Section A.4. This may be negotiated once the ASB is selected.

4. **Question:** Which specific group or entity within the Washington K-12 system is the focus of the work (e.g., students, educators, school districts, specific OSPI departments)?

Answer: The focus of the work is to provide evaluation results to OSPI Migrant Education Program (MEP) decision makers to determine how various components of the program are impacting the identified goals. Decision makers include the state advisory committee, Educational Service Districts, and OSPI MEP program staff. The evaluation process may include interviews or focus groups with students, parents/families,



Educational Service Districts, and Title I Part C funded staff who provided services to migratory students in Washington state.

5. **Question:** Is there an estimated total contract value or a ceiling amount anticipated for the six-month period of performance?

Answer: The maximum amount of compensation for this contract for the 2024-2025 evaluation is \$90,000.

6. **Question:** What is the specific title and brief statement of the work required for the solicitation covering the estimated contract period of March 2, 2026, through August 31, 2026?

Answer: The specific title is RFQQ No. 2026-11 Migrant Education Program Evaluation. The Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), must conduct a Comprehensive Needs Assessment to identify the academic and support needs of eligible migratory students. This cycle of continuous improvement is on a three-year cycle of needs assessment, service delivery, and annual evaluation of the Service Delivery Plans measurable outcomes and services. The awarded Contractor will conduct an evaluation of the existing state service delivery plan (2024-2025 and 2025-2026), and evaluation of the updated/newly developed service delivery plan. You can find more details about the proposed work in the full RFQQ on the [OSPI Competitive Procurements](#) website and WEBS.

7. **Question:** Please provide an overview of the key objectives, primary services, and expected final deliverables required of the Consultant for this contract.

Answer: Per RFQQ Section A, the Bidder selected for this procurement will be required to develop and successfully submit the following components in order to meet the Department of Education's requirements for the Title I, Part C Migrant Education Programs:

Task	Timeline
1. Evaluate the SDP for program periods, 2024-2025, 2025-2026, 2026-2027, and 2027-2028(subject to contract renewal).	SDP 24-25 – April 2026 – July 2026 SDP 25-26 – September 2026 – January 2027 (optional contract renewal 1) SDP 26-27 – January 2028 (optional renewal 2) SDP 27-28 – January 2029 (optional renewal 3)
2. Provide evaluation results and recommended adjustments to current plan outcomes.	SDP 24-25 – July 2026 SDP 25-26 – January 2027 (optional renewal 1) SDP 26-27 – January 2028 (optional renewal 2) SDP 27-28 – January 2029 (optional renewal 3)

Objective: In accordance with ESEA's Title I Part C Education of Migratory Children, conduct an annual evaluation of the state Service Delivery Plan.

Scope of Work:

Evaluate Service Delivery Plan

- Conduct a complete and thorough evaluation of OSPI's MEP, based on performance outcomes identified in the Service Delivery Plan 2024-2025, 2025-2026, 2026-2027, 2027-2028. This evaluation shall allow the State Education Agency (SEA) and local agencies to:
- Evaluate the results of measurable performance outcomes established in SDP.
- Evaluate Washington state's efforts to meet identified performance targets.
- Determine whether the program is achieving its goals and document its impact on migrant children.
- Improve program planning by comparing the effectiveness of the different types of services.
- Determine the degree to which services and projects implemented aligned to the plan, and identify problems encountered in program implementation.
- Provide evaluation results and recommendations with suggested changes to current SDP.
- Provide training to Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program staff (state, ESDs, and local) on analyzing and interpreting data for program adjustments and services.

Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

All LEAs operating a local program in Washington state are required to meet federal law outlined in section 1301-1309, Title I Part C-Education of Migratory Children contained in the current ESEA. Through a formula process, the OSPI's MEP currently awards Title I Part C funds to qualified regular and summer programs. The Contractor shall conduct a comparative analysis of LEAs, with both qualitative comparisons of processes, procedures, and levels of compliance with Title I Part C, and quantitative analyses of student achievement and other quantifiable outcome measures in alignment with the identified outcomes of the State Service Delivery Plan. Quantitative data such as achievement data and other student-level data collected by the state shall be made available to the Contractor via redacted data files compliant with the agency's Data and Information Handling and Disposal Policy (Exhibit G). The Contractor shall collaborate with LEAs to secure consistent program data, and any additional data as appropriate for cross-validation purposes. The Bidder shall include in their budget all costs associated with travel and communication with the LEAs; no additional funding for these expenses will be provided. Additionally, the Contractor shall not be allocated space or technology resources at LEAs for activities associated with this contract.

Migrant Student Data, Recruitment, and Support office (MSDRS)

Background and specific work by the Bidder shall include all costs associated with travel and communication with the MSDRS; no additional funding for these expenses provided. The Contractor shall not be allocated space and technology resources at MSDRS for activities associated with this contract.

- MSDRS is located at Sunnyside School District in Sunnyside, Washington and is contracted by OSPI's MEP to provide the following statewide services.
- Conduct quality control and review all Certificates of Eligibility (COEs).
- Managing the migratory student academic and health database system (Migrant Student Information System [MSIS]).
- Managing the interface of the state migratory student database and the national migratory student database system (Migrant Student Information Exchange [MSIX]).
- Manage and maintain the Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) Program for credit accrual opportunities to eligible migratory students.

Educational Service Districts (ESDs) Migrant Education Programs

OSPI's MEP program contracts with Education School District (ESD) 105 in Yakima, Washington; North Central ESD 171 in Wenatchee, Washington; ESD 123 in Pasco, Washington; and North West ESD 189 in Anacortes, Washington. The Bidder shall include in their budget, all costs associated with travel and communication with the ESDs; no additional funding for these expenses shall be provided. The Contractor shall not be allocated space and technology resources at the ESD for activities associated with this contract.

The four ESDs current contract provides support to OSPI's MEP by providing the following statewide services:

- Provide professional development to LEAs to identify the academic and support needs of migratory student needs, build understanding of migratory lifestyle, and the theory of Funds of Knowledge on which to develop culturally relevant programming.
- Organize, host, and attend statewide coordinator meetings.
- Support and provide technical assistance to LEA strategies to increase parent involvement for local Parent Advisory Council (PACs) and develop opportunities for parents to build awareness about their roles and responsibilities within the school system.
- Provide alignment between SDP, LEA grants, ESD Scope of Work and reporting requirements.
- Organize cross-collaboration with OSPI's assessment, teaching, and systems improvement programs.
- Collaborate with OSPI's Multilingual Program to ensure access to English Language development programs for multilingual migratory students.

- Support training and technical assistance to LEAs to close the achievement gap for migratory students in English Language Arts, Science, and Math.
- Collaborate with LEAs for strategies for continuance of migratory students (e.g., grade promotion, drop-out prevention; drop-out student retrieval) and transition of secondary school students to postsecondary education or employment.
- Work with LEAs to support non-academic activities such as advocacy and outreach on behalf of migratory students, family engagement, and literacy.
- Explore Early Childhood Programming models for migratory students.
- Solicit innovative programming from LEAs based on intervention, implementation, and academic improvement outcomes.
- Assist LEAs in planning summer school and intersession programs to provide academic and support opportunities to migratory students.
- Provide training to migrant-funded districts and schools in the use of data to inform and tailor supplemental instruction. Data analysis includes subject areas and /or strands in which migrant students have not met standards.
- Ensure all ESD sponsored district professional learning activities are reported to the SEA.

You can find this information and more details about the key objectives, primary services, and expected final deliverables in section A.4. of the RFQQ on the OSPI [Competitive Procurements](#) website and WEBS.

8. **Question:** Which specific group or entity within the Washington K-12 system is the focus of the work (e.g., students, educators, school districts, specific OSPI departments)?

Answer: The focus of the work is to provide evaluation results to program decision makers to determine how various components of the program are impacting the identified goals. Decision makers include the state advisory committee, Educational Service Districts, and program staff. The evaluation process may include interviews or focus groups with students, parents/families, Educational Service Districts and Title I Part C funded staff who provided services to migratory students in Washington state.

9. **Question:** Given the range of listed commodity codes, which code best represents the primary service area of this contract?

Answer: The commodity code that best represents the primary service area of the work outlined in RFQQ 2026-11 is 924-05: Educational Advisory Services.

10. **Question:** Where specifically on the OSPI website can the complete RFQQ document be found if a consultant is not yet registered on the Washington Electronic Business Solution (WEBS) Procurement website?

Answer: You can find the complete RFQQ document on the OSPI [Competitive Procurements](#) site and WEBS.

11. **Question:** If a consultant successfully downloads the RFQQ documents, is their submission of contact information sufficient to receive all amendments and Q&A documents, or is active WEBS registration under the specified codes strictly required to be notified?

Answer: All interested Bidders must be actively registered with WEBS under the following commodity codes to receive automatic notifications: 918-38: Education and Training Consulting; 924-05: Educational Advisory Services; 924-18: Educational Services, Alternative; 924-19: Educational Research Services; 924-71: School Operation and Management Services to receive all amendments and Q&A documents.

12. **Question:** Is there an estimated total contract value or a ceiling amount anticipated for the six-month period of performance?

Answer: The maximum amount of compensation for this contract for the 2024-2025 evaluation is \$90,000. This can be found in the complete RFQQ document on the OSPI [Competitive Procurements](#) website and WEBS.

13. **Question:** Will minutes or a recording of the Pre-Bid Conference (scheduled for 1:00 p.m. PT on December 8, 2025) be posted to the OSPI and WEBS websites for consultants who cannot attend?

Answer: There will not be minutes or a recording of the Pre-Bid Conference, but the questions and answers discussed during the conference have been posted as Addendum 01 the OSPI [Competitive Procurements](#) website and WEBS.

14. **Question:** What are the mandatory minimum qualifications (e.g., years of experience, specific certifications, subject matter expertise) that Consultants must satisfy to be eligible?

Answer: Per RFQQ Section A.5.:

- 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.
- Experience collecting and analyzing student data on highly mobile student populations, or similar populations including migratory student populations.
- Experience facilitating group forums to glean information pertinent to the evaluation and establishment of the academic and support needs of at-risk, highly mobile student populations.
- Experience developing summaries and reports reflecting data collection and group facilitation.
- Experience presenting summaries and reports to various stakeholders serving the academic and support needs of migratory students.

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. You can find this information and the desirable qualifications in section A.5. of the RFQQ on the OSPI [Competitive Procurements](#) website and WEBS.

15. **Question:** What is the required format for the proposal of submission (e.g., mandatory sections, page limits, required exhibits)?

Answer: Agency Proposals must be formatted to print on eight and one-half by eleven (8 ½ 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 three (3) major sections of the proposal are to be submitted in the order noted below:

1. Letter of Submittal including signed certifications, as applicable
 - a. Certifications and Assurances
 - b. Contract Issues List (if applicable)
 - c. Qualification Affirmations
 - d. Contract Intake Form
2. Management Proposal
3. Cost 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.

See Section C of the RFQQ on the OSPI [Competitive Procurements](#) website and WEBS for additional information.

16. **Question:** Which specific mandatory forms, such as the Certifications and Assurances Exhibit, must be submitted with the proposal by the Proposal Due Date (3:00 p.m. PT on January 5, 2026)?

Answer: This checklist identifies the components that must be submitted to constitute a complete proposal. Proposals that do not include the components identified below may be rejected as nonresponsive. In addition, a bidder's failure to complete any submittal as instructed may result in the proposal being rejected. Bidders may not provide unsolicited materials. For any supplemental materials expressly required by this procurement in writing, bidders must identify such supplemental materials with the bidder's name.

This checklist does not need to be submitted with your proposal.

Component
Letter of Submittal
Management Proposal
References
Cost Proposal
Certifications and Assurances The certification must be signed and submitted by a duly authorized representative for the bidder. Download an editable version from OSPI's website
Qualification Affirmations Bidder must confirm that the bidder meets all minimum qualifications set forth in the Minimum Qualifications section. Download an editable version from OSPI's website
Contract Issues List Bidders need only to complete and submit this Exhibit <i>if</i> bidder has issues, concerns, exceptions, or objections to any of the terms or conditions contained herein. Download an editable version from OSPI's website
Contractor Intake Form Must be signed and submitted by a duly authorized representative for the bidder. Download an editable version from OSPI's website
Washington State Business License , if applicable (see <i>Contractor Intake Form</i>). Provide a copy of the business license, or the UBI number on the <i>Contractor Intake Form</i> . A bidder without a Washington State Business License may submit a proposal. Contingent upon award, the bidder may be required to obtain a license. For more information about this, visit the Department of Revenue website.

You can find this checklist and all required documents in the full RFQQ on the OSPI [Competitive Procurements](#) website and WEBS.

17. **Question:** I cannot find reference to the use of artificial intelligence in data analysis or reporting within the RFQQ. May the selected vendor use AI-assisted tools (e.g., statistical modeling support, qualitative coding assistance, or generative drafting tools) as part of the evaluation process, provided that all student-level data remain secured in compliance with FERPA and Exhibits F and G? If AI-assisted tools are permissible, are there any additional restrictions, disclosures, or approvals required from OSPI to ensure compliance with state and federal data privacy requirements?

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.

18. **Question:** Will OSPI provide the vendor with access to anonymized or redacted data files already prepared by OSPI, or will the vendor be responsible for proposing a specific data request under Exhibit F?

Answer: OSPI will supply the vendor with the relevant data as part of the Program Evaluation as part of a Data Sharing Agreement.

19. **Question:** Are there any existing dashboards, analytic tools, or evaluation frameworks currently used by OSPI that the vendor should align with or build upon?

Answer: The Migratory Education Program at OSPI uses data from the Comprehensive Education Data And Research System (CEDARS) and from the state Migrant Student Data Reporting and Support (MSDRS) office to track and evaluate the program. This data will be shared with the selected vendor. The OSPI website also has publicly available data regarding all students found here on the OSPI website: [Data & Reporting](#).

20. **Question:** Are there expected differences in interaction intensity with LEAs depending on program models (regular year vs. summer vs. preschool programs)?

Answer: No, all programs, contracts, school districts and organizations are required to report all usage of Title I Part C Funds. Some schools/districts have more to report than others, therefore may have more data to review.

21. **Question:** For qualitative components, does OSPI have any preferred or required approaches (e.g., bilingual facilitation for families, translation expectations, Pacific Northwest language access considerations, etc.)?

Answer: Yes, OSPI will work with the chosen Bidder to determine the best approach for each situation. In the past, OSPI facilitated Contractor connection with school districts and Educational Service Districts (ESDs) to schedule meetings, interviews and focus groups. Our experience shows that a mix of in person, phone and virtual meetings work well depending on the parameters. OSPI will also help facilitate interpreters and translation services. This can be discussed further with the selected Bidder during contract negotiations.

22. **Question:** Are there minimum sample sizes or required representation thresholds for stakeholder engagement activities (e.g., parents, migratory youth, teachers, PAC members)?
Answer: No, some districts are very small and some large, but we still want representation from all the areas/demographics this program serves.
23. **Question:** Does OSPI expect interim deliverables and/or periodic briefings between major evaluation milestones?
Answer: Yes, during contract negotiations OSPI will work with the selected Bidder to schedule ongoing meetings with the Contractor for check-ins, status updates and time for questions/concerns.
24. **Question:** Is OSPI willing to convene an internal review team to provide feedback on draft reports, and if so, what is the typical turnaround time for revisions?
Answer: OSPI will be reviewing the reports and findings throughout the process during the regular check-in meetings. If this is a preference of the selected Bidder, we can discuss timelines during the contract negotiations.
25. **Question:** Are there geographic priority regions where in-person evaluation activities are strongly encouraged?
Answer: The Migratory Education Program primarily works in four specific ESD regions; ESD 171 Wenatchee, ESD 105 Yakima Valley, ESD 123 Pasco region and ESD 189 Skagit Valley. The program also works with school districts in southwestern Washington.
26. **Question:** How many Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in Washington State are currently operating a Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program?
Answer: There are currently 79 LEAs that receive Title I Part C funding through grants serving migratory students. We term these "project districts". There are additionally 145 "non project" LEAs that do not operate a Title I Part C Migrant Education Program but do have migratory students in their district and receive supports from local Educational Service Districts and the state.
27. **Question:** Does OSPI facilitate introductions or coordination with LEAs, ESDs, and MSDRS for evaluation-related activities?
Answer: Yes, OSPI will inform Title I Part C staff across the state through emails and quarterly meetings that we are in the process of a program evaluation and who we are working with. OSPI will also provide introductions and LEA contact information for the Contractor.
28. **Question:** Are LEAs, ESDs, and MSDRS required to participate in evaluation-related data collection activities, or is participation voluntary and coordinated through OSPI?

Answer: Participation from LEAs, ESDs and MSDRS is not required, but highly suggested. Staff have been receptive to interviews, focus groups and surveys previously. Part of this work is intended to provide program improvements that support the staff who support the students. Participation is coordinated through the OSPI and Contractor partnership, working together to engage and involve staff, students, and families.

29. **Question:** Are bidders expected to provide translation and/or interpretation services as part of this project, and should associated costs be included in the cost proposal?

Answer: OSPI and school districts will work with the chosen Bidder to identify language needs and coordinate access to interpreters.

30. **Question:** Should the proposed budget cover only the first SDP evaluation program period, 2024-2025, or does OSPI want vendors to submit budgets for option years also: 2025-2026, 2026-2027, and 2027-2028?

Answer: This budget proposal will only cover the one-year program period 2024-2025 program evaluation. This project is a 1-year contract starting in March 2026 and ending August 31, 2026, with the possibility of extending it for three more years (each one-year at a time). Typically, around June 2026 before this contract has ended, the chosen Bidder and OSPI will begin discussion for renewal and continuation of services for the 2025-2026 program evaluation. Submitting **projected costs** to conduct evaluation activities for year's 2026-2027 and 2027-2028 are appropriate for the scope of the proposal.

31. **Question:** Can you please clarify this question on page 9 of the RFQQ: "To what extent is the LEAs knowledge of the State Service Delivery Plan, Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs), and articulated strategies to achieve the MPOs?" It appears to be missing a word or phrase.

Answer: State Migrant Education Programs (MEPs) are required to write a Service Delivery Plan (SDP) to provide guidance to the state and to the local migrant education projects. The plan shall include measurable outcomes the MEP will produce statewide through specific educational or educationally related services (see ESEA Title I, Part C, Section 1306(a)(1)(D) of the statute). Measurable outcomes allow the MEP to determine whether and to what degree the program has met the educational needs of migrant children identified through the comprehensive needs assessment. The measurable outcomes should also help achieve the State's performance targets.

This question is asking the evaluator to assess the levels at which the LEA staff understand these guidelines provided by the state, the outcomes that the plan is hoping to achieve, and the strategies that each LEA is implementing to reach these goals as part of a comparative analysis for ongoing technical assistance and support.

32. **Question:** Will firms currently under contract to conduct the needs assessment be eligible to apply for this solicitation, or would that be considered an organizational conflict of interest?

Answer: Yes, Contractors currently under contract and Contractors who have previously held contracts at OSPI are eligible to apply for this solicitation. All proposals are reviewed by a panel of OSPI staff and rated based on a standardized rubric.

33. **Question:** Could you provide any additional information about why the evaluation contract could not continue as anticipated?

Answer: The previous contract lapsed and could not be renewed/amended, so OSPI chose to issue a new competitive procurement to re-procure the services.

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