

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

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
RFP No. 2018-13: Alignment Study – Washington Science Assessments  
Addendum 01: Q&A**

*Note to potential respondents:*

*This addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2018-13, issued November 20, 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:** Should honoraria for panelists be included in the cost proposal? If so, is there a standard stipend amount that OSPI is expecting be honored?

**ANSWER:** The application of honoraria has a time of year dependency – with inviting teachers to the process, participation requires use of either personal time or class-release time. With class-release districts incur additional costs in using substitutes to cover for the participants (the participants remain under contract); with personal time, OSPI would expect participants receive compensation for their time and effort. In either scenario, OSPI views the payment of substitution costs or honoraria as part of the bidder's responsibility to the project. OSPI typically uses an estimate of \$200/day for either scenario.

**QUESTION:** Would it be acceptable for organizations to partner in a bid such that one vendor addresses the alignment of the WCAS and another vendor addresses the alignment of WA-AIM?

**ANSWER:** Yes.

**QUESTION:** We understand the intent of the Access Point Framework referenced in the RFP and further described online (<http://www.k12.wa.us/Assessment/WA-AIM/Frameworks.aspx>). From the assessment design perspective, are assessment tasks intended to be aligned with the framework at a certain one of the three levels of access points (more complex / intermediate / less complex)? Is there any expectation for tasks to be distributed in any way across the different access levels?

**ANSWER:** There is a specific task associated with each level of the Access Point Framework. The assessment design does not provide for any specific task (as written) to have distributed use across access point levels.

**QUESTION:** In RFP 2018-13 p. 19 section 2A. Alignment Plan – Considerations, bullet points 2 and 3, there is reference to orientation/overview presented by OSPI and receipt and review of OSPI materials. We are interpreting this to mean that the proposal should include allotted time for reviewing OSPI materials in advance of the in-person meeting as well as budget for time at the in-person meeting for OSPI to present these materials? If this interpretation is incorrect, please clarify. If this interpretation is correct, could OSPI provide an estimate of the time needed at the in-person meeting for this training? (e.g. <2 hrs; half-day, full-day, etc.)

**ANSWER:** The larger interpretation is accurate – OSPI wishes for bidders to allot accordingly time to have bidder staff become familiar with the associated information related to the two assessments for purposes of effecting smooth fulfillment of the project, as well as time allotted

to orient the attendees of the in-person meeting on enough of the assessment design to allow optimum participation in the alignment study efforts.

**QUESTION:** Consideration of “appropriateness of DOK” is mentioned on RFP p. 24 and reference to evaluation of “cognitive complexity” is mentioned on RFP. p. 9. Has OSPI or (other WCES WA-AIM stakeholders assigned DOK (or any other language system) to the PEs (and/or any other components of the Washington State 2013 K-12 Science Learning Standards)? In general, how has OSPI approached the evaluation of the cognitive complexity of the standards?

**ANSWER:** To date there has been no systematic means of assigning depth of knowledge (DOK) to the PEs in the science standards though there are conversations in process to give consideration to such thinking. Additionally, OSPI has applied no strict process to evaluate the cognitive complexity of the standards. Specific to the WA-AIM assessment, an element of cognitive complexity is part of the design thinking with respect to the three levels of access in the frameworks design.

**QUESTION:** Does OSPI expect the alignment review team to use the same rubrics (Context Judgment and Individual Item Judgment, RFP p. 22-23) as used by the internal science assessment team to evaluate contexts/items as part of the alignment analysis?

**ANSWER:** Not necessarily – the information provided on pages 22 and 23 of the RFP (as well as many other places in the document) were intended to provide prospective bidders information on the processes OSPI applied in its development activities and to give more details for consideration by prospective bidders on how to establish the technical proposal/outline for conducting requested alignment studies.

**QUESTION:** Can OSPI comment on if and /or the extent to which the Achieve draft alignment criteria, shown in Appendix E, should guide the alignment study? Is OSPI open to any potential (reasonable, defensible) adjustments or modifications to the criteria?

**ANSWER:** As with an earlier response, the referenced Achieve document was intended as information for consideration by a prospective bidder in devising an alignment study proposal. The information from the Achieve document, as well as other referenced sources, will be used in an overall judgment of each submitted proposal. Technically defensible alternative solutions are welcomed as part of any submitted proposal.