

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

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RFP No. 2017-05
Addendum 02 – Complaint Response**

Note to potential respondents:

This addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2017-05, issued February 15, 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.

As required by RCW 39.26.170, OSPI's Request for Proposal includes procedures to handle consultant complaints. Per the process, OSPI's response, and any changes to the RFP will be posted to WEBS prior to the proposal due date. The procedure, the complaint, and OSPI's response are as follows:

COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

The complaint process is available to Consultants interested in this RFP. The complaint process allows Consultants to focus on the solicitation requirements and evaluation process and raise issues with these processes early enough in the process to allow an agency to correct a problem before proposals are submitted and time expended on evaluations.

A Consultant may submit a complaint based on any of the following:

- The solicitation unnecessarily restricts competition;
- The solicitation evaluation or scoring process is unfair or flawed; or
- The solicitation requirements are inadequate or insufficient to prepare a response.

Consultants may submit complaints up to five (5) business days prior to the proposal due date noted in the Estimated Schedule of Procurement Activities. However, Consultants are encouraged to submit complaints as soon as possible so OSPI can rectify the issue(s) early in the process. Complaints must be submitted to the RFP Coordinator. In order to be considered a valid complaint, the complaint must meet the following requirements:

- Must be in writing.
- Should clearly articulate the basis for the complaint.
- Should include a proposed remedy.

Complaints not received by the deadline noted in the Estimated Schedule of Procurement Activities will not be reviewed by OSPI.

The OSPI Contracts Administrator or an employee delegated by the Contracts Administrator will review valid complaints and respond to the submitter in writing. The response, and any changes to the RFP will be posted to WEBS prior to the proposal due date. Any complaint addressed during the complaint process cannot be raised during the protest process.

COMPLAINT

Basis for Complaint

1. **[Timeline]** After careful review of the Background, Objective and Scope of Work as well as the Period of Performance, I am immediately concerned about the timeline given to complete both phases for this critical work. Because the 4 components of the Exhibit E Cultural Competence Matrix are so extensive, and rightfully so, it will take much longer than 14 weeks to develop an effective professional development training module that can be utilized throughout the state. Although the Matrix is essential to the development of the training program, the individual(s) tasked to develop these modules need to consider the following:

*In an article published in 2007 from Principal Leadership magazine, education researchers Nuri-Robins, D. Lindsey, Terrell & R. Lindsey (2007) state that a quality cultural proficiency program must have four components. These components must be understood by all participants, but especially by those leading the effort. Included are the **Guiding Principles, Continuum, Essential Elements and the Barriers** (p. 18). The Guiding Principles represent the underlying values “upon which the [cultural competence] approach is built” while the Continuum is a “conceptual framework for assessing personal and organizational progress” (p. 19). This framework is like an assessment barometer which gages the status of the individual or organization that undergoes this training. It can be checked regularly throughout the process to see the growth within individuals and system-wide. Along with personal and system-wide assessments, the Essential Elements are used as standards that “serve as guidelines for culturally proficient interaction” (p. 19) where all stakeholders have roles they play to meet these standards. Although last on the list, but probably integral to the entire process of change is the fourth component: Barriers. Leaders and participants must strive to be acutely aware of the likely barriers that impede the process of becoming a culturally proficient school. The article highlights the three categories or most difficult obstacles to overcome: “Unawareness of the need to adapt and resistance to change, presumption of entitlement and unearned privilege and systems of oppression and privilege (p. 19). Each of these categories likely manifests in different forms within each school, but response to these barriers requires sensitivity and patience. Meaningful conversations about these obstacles could be vital to the process.*

The Scope of Work, which needs a “continuum” that includes assessment and revision is not factored into the development of this training program.

2. **[Training Structure]** In addition, because the expected audience to partake in this training is so diverse in education, professional experience and level of student interaction, these modules must be treated like curriculum. In other words, the online modules must differentiate for the varying needs of the expected audiences. This also takes time create and revise due to the research necessary to meet all needs throughout the state of Washington. According to Center of Educational Innovation out of the University of Minnesota, a course for professional development, which includes an online component may take from 9 months to a year. Your timeline allows for just under 100 days, which is not enough time to develop an effective program.
3. **[Qualifications]** Finally, the RFP requirements which do not require that the consultant have K-12 teaching experience could be viewed as an additional example of a program that accidentally creates additional institutional racism or discrimination within our

schools. In other words, this professional development program will directly impact over 1 million students in K-12 classrooms throughout the state of Washington, which includes about 44% students of color, multi-race and students of Asian descent for whom classroom learning experiences may be negatively impacted due to a teacher's cultural bias or insensitivity to the student. When this happens, a student can quickly become disenfranchised, which inadvertently can immediately and negatively impact that achievement gap that is already too wide. Moreover, since 92% of K-12 classroom teachers are not persons of color, multi-race or of Asian descent, this cultural competence training program could have a significant impact on many teachers who may not have any experience or internalized understanding of the extent of the micro aggressions that occur in classrooms every day. If the consultant does not have experience teaching in the system for whom he/she is about to teach across the state, the chances of successfully making a positive impact that is well-received with professional regard is not likely to occur.

PROPOSED REMEDY AND OSPI'S RESPONSE

OSPI's Response to Consultant's Complaint:

- 1) **[Timeline]** The timeline established in the RFP is in response to the requirements of the funding for the training, which passed in Fourth Substitute House Bill 1541, with the funding ending by the end of this state fiscal year (June 30, 2017). Extensive state level work has already been completed to inform the cultural competence training (see Addendum 01 which contains more details about the Cultural Competence Workgroup and the Professional Educators Standards Board's cultural competence matrix), which includes stakeholder engagement through the workgroup and the matrix is organized along a continuum to address the career continuum of experience and expertise for educators.
- 2) **[Training Structure]** Yes, the training is expected to be differentiated to the following audiences, as specified in Fourth Substitute House Bill 1541 Classified school staff, district administrators, certificated instructional staff and principals at the school level. The professional development and training must also contain components suitable for delivery by individuals from the local community or community based organizations with appropriate expertise. Again, since much of the research work has already been completed by the PESB and Cultural Competence Workgroup, the timeline was built with that in mind.
- 3) **[Qualifications]** The RFP includes the requirement in both Phase 1 & 2 of the Objective and Scope of Work for collaboration with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, the [Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee \(EOGOAC\)](#), the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB), colleges of education and representatives from diverse communities and community based organizations. The EOGOAC was the group that made the recommendations in their annual reports that created Fourth Substitute House Bill 1541 and is the statewide committee focused on closing opportunity gaps. The committee is charged by [RCW 28A.300.136](#) to synthesize the findings and recommendations from the five 2008 Achievement Gap Studies into an implementation plan and recommend policies and strategies to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Professional Educator Standards Board and the State Board of Education in the following areas:
 - Supporting and facilitating parent and community involvement and outreach.

- Enhancing the cultural competency of current and future educators and the cultural relevance of curriculum and instruction.
- Expanding pathways and strategies to prepare and recruit diverse teachers and administrators.
- Recommending current programs and resources that should be redirected to narrow the gap.
- Identifying data elements and systems needed to monitor progress in closing the gap.
- Making closing the achievement gap part of the school and school district improvement process.
- Exploring innovative school models that have shown success in closing the achievement gap.

The EOGOAC has the following representatives:

Name	Representing
Carrie Basas * Yasin Abshir (alternate)	Office of the Education Ombuds (OEO)
Sally Brownfield Bernard Thomas (alternate)	Tribal Nations-Governor's Office of Indian Affairs
Fiasili Savusa * Mele Aho (alternate)	Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs (Pacific American)
Representative Lillian Ortiz-Self	House of Representatives, Additional member appointed by the Speaker of the House
Frieda Takamura Julie Kang (alternate)	Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs (Asian American)
Dr. Wanda Billingsly * Dr. James Smith (alternate)	Commission on African American Affairs
Superintendent Chris Reykdal	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Representative Bob McCaslin	House of Representatives, Designee for Ranking Minority Member
Senator John McCoy	Senate, Designee for Ranking Minority Member
Representative Sharon Tomiko Santos	House of Representatives, Education Committee Chair
Senator Sam Hunt	Senate, Additional member appointed by the President of the Senate
Senator Hans Zeiger	Senate, Early Learning and K-12 Education Chair
Ricardo Sanchez *Alex Ybarra (alternate)	Commission on Hispanic Affairs

The Ethnic Commissions and Governor's Office of Indian Affairs, as well as the Tribal Leaders Congress are both on the EOGOAC and will be included in the diverse communities consulted with. They also will use their networks to communicate and gather feedback from community based organizations as well. Additionally the [Professional Educator Standards Board \(PESB\)](#) consists of twelve members appointed by the Governor, the majority of whom are practicing educators. PESB created the Cultural Competence Workgroup and Matrix and will provide deep perspectives from the roles of K-12 educators in collaborating and reviewing the content for the training.

OSPI's Response to Consultant's Proposed Remedies:

- **PROPOSED REMEDY: Training Structure:** The Scope of Work should be modified to include a Phase 3 entitled Assessment & Revision, which represents the missing "continuum" mentioned above, which is an essential component of any effective cultural competence training program.

OSPI RESPONSE: Phase 1 & 2 already include required collaboration with identified groups for review and will include the opportunity for feedback and potential revisions to draft training materials.

- **PROPOSED REMEDY: Timeline:** The proposal due date should be extended to June 30, 2017.
 - Because the educators that are well-versed in culturally competent education are teaching during the academic year, this contract period should not begin before July 1, 2017, in order to allow the most competent teaching professionals to participate in the development of this cultural competency training program.
- The contract period should require a minimum of 9 months and a maximum of 12 months in light of the depth and breadth of this Scope of Work, which includes, not only developing the content/curriculum, but also the method of delivery (online components) for varying adult audiences throughout the state that will view and interact with these modules.
 - As a result of this new contract period, OSPI's budget for this contract will need to be adjusted so that it is commensurate with the scope of work and new contract timeline. In other words, if a teacher takes an academic year's leave of absence, this contract could include a teacher's full salary and benefits so that this work would be completed by June 30, 2018, prior to the 2018-2019 academic school year.

OSPI RESPONSE: The due date cannot be extended to June 30, 2017, because funding cannot be extended beyond the state fiscal year (which ends June 30, 2017). Again, since much of the research has already been completed by PESB and the Cultural Competence Workgroup, the timeline will remain as indicated in the RFP. The budget will not be adjusted.

- **PROPOSED REMEDY: Qualifications:** Consultant qualifications should also REQUIRE at least 5 years of teaching experience in the K-12 public school system in Washington State.

OSPI RESPONSE: The minimum qualifications will not be changed to require K-12 public school experience. As one of the required stakeholder groups includes PESB, with practicing educators, there is not a requirement for K-12 teaching experience. Additionally, the minimum requirements include the following:

- Depth of knowledge regarding cultural competence in education
- Proven research in cultural competence
- Background and research in cultural competency and understanding of PESB cultural competence matrix for educators
- Background in creating professional development content for school staff