

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

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
RFP No. 2017-02  
Addendum 01 – Q&A**

*Note to potential respondents:*

*This addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2017-02, issued January 6, 2017.*

*All amendments, addendums, and notifications will be posted on the [OSPI website](#) (if this was an open procurement) and released via the Washington Electronic Business Solution ([WEBS](#)) website.*

**QUESTION:** The RFP says that proposals that exceed \$50,000 will be ruled ineligible for award; however, in a different place, it mentions that additional funds might be available. Can you help us reconcile these two statements?

**ANSWER:** Additional funding may be available for this project at a later date. However, since it is not guaranteed, and the exact amount is uncertain, proposals shall not exceed \$50,000 for the project at this time.

**QUESTION:** Are there any maximum page length limitations or suggestions for this proposal?

**ANSWER:** The Letter of Submittal, excluding the signed Certifications and Assurances and Contractor Intake Form, shall be a maximum of one (1) page. Aside from that, there are no limitations.

**QUESTION:** On page 6 of the RFP, it says, “Conduct in-person or telephone interviews with three (3) to five (5) designated WA-TPL district teams, OSPI, ESD partners, coaches, and the external evaluator.” Approximately how many individuals serve on the WA-TPL district teams?

**ANSWER:** Approximately 4-6 per team.

**QUESTION:** Approximately how many OSPI staff, ESD partners, and coaches work with the each district? Are these individuals the same across districts (e.g., one or two contacts at OSPI that work with all districts on the WA-TPL project, 3 to 4 coaches that work with participating districts, etc.)?

**ANSWER:** There are 2 individuals from OSPI, 5 from Educational Service Districts, and 4 coaches across the project.

**QUESTION:** The RFP specifies an interview methodology. Are individual interviews preferred or are group interviews (within teams, not across stakeholder groups) also acceptable?

**ANSWER:** Group interviews are acceptable.

**QUESTION:** On page 6 of the RFP, it says, “Analyze and summarize results in draft reports for review by the project manager and advisory team.” Is this statement referring to the case study reports?

**ANSWER:** Yes.

**QUESTION:** Are the case study reports separate deliverables from the final report with the executive summary?

**ANSWER:** No, they are one in the same.

**QUESTION:** Are the designated districts for the case studies intended to be lab districts only, or should the designated districts include both lab districts and critical friend districts?

**ANSWER:** All are critical friend districts in the Project Extension.

**QUESTION:** The previous evaluation report indicates there is a program logic model. Can the logic model be provided for proposers?

**ANSWER:** No, not at this time.

**QUESTION:** Will the data from the prior evaluation be made available to the contractor for this work?

**ANSWER:** Yes, data from the prior evaluation can be made available to the selected contractor.

**QUESTION:** The key activities of this project, in collaboration with critical stakeholders, is to document the work, activities, and key learnings of the WA-TPL for public dissemination. The scope of work includes, in part, interviewing the previous evaluator and reviewing findings. Is the previous evaluator allowed to apply for this project?

**ANSWER:** Yes.

**QUESTION:** Do you have a target size for the final document, and can you give us a sense of the type and number of graphics to be included?

**ANSWER:** The “succinct, articulate, informative, comprehensive narrative document” may be in the 40-page range, more or less, depending on the nature of the case studies and related content. The number and type of graphics and call-outs should be adequate to reinforce the narrative writing and help make it inviting and ultimately readable; related subjective choices will be guided by Consultant in partnership with OSPI.

**QUESTION:** I have one of the WA-TPL districts as a client (which is where I recently learned about this RFP). In your estimation, might that disqualify me from consideration? Do you see a potential conflict of interest?

**ANSWER:** As long as you are not providing the same services that are mentioned in this procurement a current/previous relationship with WA-TPL districts does not present a conflict of interest.

**QUESTION:** I am not clear from the RFP as to the precise purpose of the final product. Do you anticipate using this as a teaching tool? Or a story to communicate improvement efforts? As part of your overall evaluation to extend that of your formal evaluator? Who do you see as the primary audience(s)?

**ANSWER:** WA-TPL is the first statewide professional learning project of its kind. Various audiences, stakeholders internal and external to our state including legislatures and state Departments of Education, are interested in what took place, how, why, and lessons learned. This document, as an outgrowth of the formal evaluation, will tell that story. Not as a teaching tool per se, but a “here’s what we did” document that may help in replication. Transforming professional learning is about system change and improvement.

**QUESTION:** ... I am a sole proprietorship and I wonder from the RFP whether you are looking for a larger entity. I would prefer to know this before embarking on a proposal.

**ANSWER:** We will accept proposals from individuals as well as groups (corporations, LLC, etc.).