WASHINGTON STATE SCHOOL DIRECTORS' ASSOCIATION
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS:
WSSDA OnBoard Curriculum Development
RFQ NO. 2018-096

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Issued June 13, 2018

BACKGROUND:
This RFQ was issued on June 1, 2018, and submissions will be due July 2, 2018. It was posted to WSSDA's contracting opportunities Web page and disseminated via the State of Washington Electronic Business Solutions (WEBS) system to potential vendors. In addition, notice of the RFQ opportunity was communicated during the first two weeks of June in the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce.

This package of Questions and Answers is being shared with organizations that sought clarification on the RFQ. If necessary, a final Questions and Answers package will be posted on June 26, 2018

Please Note: It is important for any interested party to carefully review section 1 of the RFQ, including hyperlinks to additional information.

THIS PACKAGE INCLUDES QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING:

  A. **Proposal Content and Submission**
  B. **Deliverables**
  C. **Sample Contract**

A. Proposal Content and Submission

1. **We have many work samples we can provide, however most are online. Is it acceptable to provide descriptions of these samples, screenshots, and where possible demo accounts for your evaluation committee to access and view?**

   Yes, that is acceptable.

2. **What type of curriculum development would you be interested in seeing in samples?**

   Please refer to page 3 and 4 of the RFQ for this information.

3. **Are you interested in seeing samples of eLearning modules?**

   Yes, please refer to page 6 of RFQ.

4. **Are these letters of reference to be specifically referencing our qualifications to for this project (or may they be more generic testimonials about our content development qualifications)?**

   We would appreciate letters of references that may be more generic and also reference qualifications for this project.

5. **Are these letters of reference to be provided after receiving notice of being a top scoring proposal (or at the time of proposal submission)?**

   Send your letters of reference at the time of submission of your proposal.

6. **Are electronic signatures acceptable for the reference letters?**

   Yes, electronic signatures would be acceptable.

7. **Will contacts for references be sufficient or should formal letters be provided?**

   On page 12 of the RFQ, we request three letters of reference.

8. **Can companies outside of Washington bid for this contract?**

   Yes, we welcome proposal from qualified parties inside and outside of the state of Washington. We would accept an Employer Identification Number (EIN) from organizations located outside of the state of Washington.

9. **Are email proposals acceptable?**

   Under Section 2.3 of the RFQ (Submission of Proposals), it states: "Consultants are required to submit two (2) paper copies of their proposal. One copy must have original signatures and the other copy may have photocopied signatures." However, in the interest of receiving proposals from all qualified parties interested, we will accept proposals through email. Those proposals will be sent to the RFQ Coordinator at the email address noted in Section 2.1. Also, electronic signatures will be accepted on proposals.

B. Deliverables

1. **The Objective of the RFP (Section 1.2) makes clear that the scope of the RFQ does not include its publishing into a learning management system (LMS). In what format(s) do you wish to receive the curriculum to be developed? (We have several approaches to this, and will elaborate about those in our reply to your RFQ, but wanted to know if there's a preference/constraint to follow.)**

   We are open to recommendations from the successful contractor for this RFQ.

2. **For delivery methods involving the use of WSSDA's learning management system, will the consultant be responsible for inputting content into the LMS or simply providing content compatible with the LMS?**

   Please see page 4 of RFQ, which states, "Development and design of the third component of the project, electronic learning management system, is not included in this scope of work. " There will be an expectation that content is compatible with future delivery systems.

3. **Is the initial meeting at the beginning of each curriculum cycle the only in-person meeting requirement?**

   There may be additional in-person meetings as determined during the initial meeting. Additionally, we expect phone and video conferencing and other communication methods as needed.

4. **Will the specific subject area content for each Onboard Content Framework component be provided by WSSDA?**

   Some subject area content will be provided through WSSDA's existing materials, but other content may require research and development.

5. **Should the consultant provide subject matter experts (SMEs) or will the consultant's focus be primarily on content design through instructional designers?**

   Depending on the focus of the cycle, both subject matter experts and instructional designers may be necessary.

6. **Will one Facilitator's Guide be developed per curriculum cycle with multiple methods of facilitation techniques included?**

   Multiple facilitation guides are likely to be developed per curriculum cycle.

7. **Approximately how many hours of learning will be designed and developed for each curriculum cycle?**

   That is unknown at this point, since it will depend on development of the content.

8. **To confirm, the content will be designed and developed in multiple deliverable types in order to facilitate diverse delivery methods?**

   Yes.

9. **Approximately how many delivery methods should be included in each curriculum cycle?**

   The various types of delivery methods are described on page 5 of the RFQ and may depend on development of the content. This will be discussed throughout the cycle development process.

10. **Will the consultant be responsible for conducting testing once the materials are input into the WSSDA OnBoard LMS?**

    As part of the development process, the contractor will be responsible for gathering input on the materials developed. Exhibit B, the Sample Professional Services Contract provides more detail on this process. At this point, the contractor will not be responsible for testing or inputting the content into an LMS.

11. **Will the consultant be responsible for setting up the data management system within the WSSDA OnBoard LMS?**

    The contractor will be responsible for the activities and deliverables outlined in the RFQ and sample contract (Exhibit B). At this point, the third component of the WSSDA Onboard System is not included in this work; please see page 4 of RFQ.

12. **What is the ideal duration we should anticipate creating for a typical learning experience about each component in the Curriculum Framework? (E.g., 45 minutes, 90 mins, half day, full day?)**

Learning experiences will vary and may be any of these lengths. It is possible to chunk together several learning experiences for a full day workshop.

C. <u>Sample Contract</u>

1. **The sample contract (Exhibit B) including a pricing of a Curriculum Cycle. Is that meant to be indicative or representative of your budget or are those numbers entirely placeholders (given that this is an RFQ and not an RFP)?**

The pricing is based on the average cost of a curriculum development cycle during 2017. The amount per cycle described in Exhibit B is the budget for all activities necessary to complete the cycle's deliverables.

2. **The RFQ states that the number of curriculum cycles to be completed shall be determined at the discretion of WSSDA (p. 5). Is there a minimum or maximum number of cycles the respondent should plan and budget for?**

The number of cycles is unknown at this point and will be determined as the content from the WSSDA OnBoard Framework is identified for each cycle.

3. **Can all administrative services described in section I.B.6 be provided remotely?**

Yes, it is acceptable for these services to be provided remotely.