

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

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
RFP No. 2020-14: Grant Management System  
Addendum 01**

*Note to potential respondents:*

*This addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2020-14, issued August 26, 2019. This addendum is for the Question and Answers from the Pre-Bid Conference.*

*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:** Of the 60-80 program staff identified as needing internal training, how many will be designated as form package builders?

**ANSWER:** There is no set number, program determine who/how many, dependent upon the division approval process. We are trying to shift from our current model which is too heavily reliant on system administrators to make all changes regarding form packages.

**QUESTION:** We should plan on 60-80 internal users will need training?

**ANSWER:** Yes

**QUESTION:** Will some be higher level users?

**ANSWER:** There will be a variety of roles, but likely that 40-50 may be building/editing form packages, with the rest approving.

**QUESTION:** This system is intended to replace both the iGrants and grants claims systems?

**ANSWER:** Yes. The grants claim system is an interface with our state financial system.

**QUESTION:** Pg. 8 of the RFP, talks about knowledge of federal grants requirements (dept of ed and dept of agriculture), what other federal agencies require interaction?

**ANSWER:** None

**QUESTION:** Pg. 13 - workflows on approving a grant application. It seemed to suggest that OSPI is looking for an intuitive system. Can you expand on that?

**ANSWER:** The current system only allows current system admins access and permissions to edit/create form packages, delays occur as users use a variety of ways to explain their reasoning and request changes year to year(e.g., Microsoft Word, email, SurveyGizmo), we are looking for the ability for the system to easily allow users to make changes themselves, rather than relying on system admin.

**QUESTION:** Are you looking to push some of the reporting to subrecipients?

**ANSWER:** The ideal system should have a user-friendly report generation tool. Training for users both internal and external should include training on how to build reports to pull useful data from the system.

**QUESTION:** Question about how the system would interact with other in place systems, such as CEDARS?

**ANSWER:** All systems are SQL based, so it's a matter of using data that exist in those systems and integrating it into this grants management. We want districts to be able to pull in data from those systems in lieu of resubmitting data. A bidder requested that OSPI provide support to vendors in connecting with other OSPI systems. Confirmed that OSPI IT will work with vendors to facilitate integrations.

**QUESTION:** Is this system funded and what is the funding mechanism?

**ANSWER:** Internally funded.

**QUESTION:** Is the funding approved?

**ANSWER:** Yes, payment schedule will be determined during contract negotiations, and will be deliverables-based.

**QUESTION:** Page 33 of Attachment A shows the budget for the IDEA 611 619 programs. There are objects of expenditures and activities, looks like standard charts of accounts data. Is that something you envision the forms package user being able to set up...or will they want to get to that level of detail?

**ANSWER:** To maintain budgeting consistency, we would like to keep the budget page as is. If we were to allow district users to develop their own budgeting format, we would have too many variations. It would our preference for the edits of this page to be controlled by the iGrants administrator within our division.

**QUESTION:** IDEA for example has proportionate share requirements and in looking at page 33 I'm not seeing anywhere the indicated what is the proportionate share reservation, is this district mandated to do 15% CCEIS, things of that nature.

**ANSWER:** Proportionate share costs are controlled at the district level. The school district would only budget for this if it was working with a private school within its district. There are rules surrounding mandatory budgeting for CCEIS. Currently, iGrants calculates the 15% for CEIS and CCEIS. The districts are not required to budget for CEIS even though it may be automatically calculated in iGrants. However, some districts choose to set aside the 15% for CEIS. As for CCEIS, this is a little more difficult to answer. If a district is found to be significantly disproportionate (this has to do with student placement and discipline), then the district is mandated to budget the 15% for CCEIS.

**QUESTION:** I think probably, to the point you just made, I'd like to see the expectation OSPI has in regards to having form package builders edit those types of rules or if some more complicated process will exist in trying to manage this and similar types of business rules"

**ANSWER:** These rules should only be edited by the iGrants administrator at the state level. Some of business requirements are based on state and federal rules and regulations.

**QUESTION:** Creating form packages the previous year, how do we handle it, with the data?

**ANSWER:** OSPI is looking to shift building of form packages to the program level. Expectation is that the vendor will be building some form packages in order to demonstrate they're able to fulfill requirements and will be responsible for training OSPI users on how to create and edit form packages.

**QUESTION:** Again on page 34 of Attachment A there appear to be links to original budgets and carryover budgets. Are those captured distinctively or are carryover funds combined in once closeout of a prior year is completed?"

**ANSWER:** The carryover budgets are distinctive to each school district and are not combined at the closeout period. Districts have 24 months to expend their Part B IDEA funds and they typically do not know their carryover budget until we notify them. Once we notify the districts of the carryover (not all of the districts will have this), then the district submits a budget revision to combine the carryover into their budget.

**QUESTION:** Functional requirements in attachment B - FRO511, it mentions that districts should have the ability to revise an application after it has been submitted to OSPI. Does your system do this currently?

**ANSWER:** OSPI will need to review and reevaluate this requirement. May differ for competitive/non-competitive grants and can potentially be managed somewhat by application status.

**QUESTION:** Do you we need to support multiple languages?

**ANSWER:** No specific requirement, but the ability to use google translate or similar functionality would add value.

**QUESTION:** Are there any mobile requirements for the application?

**ANSWER:** OSPI is not requiring any type of mobile application.

**QUESTION:** FRA023 - Ability to allow OSPI staff to search for... can you elaborate on what you are looking for?

**ANSWER:** Referring to the development of the form package. In the current system, it is difficult to modify existing text or search through existing applications. It is for searching through form packages and their components, not submitted information from applicants.

**QUESTION:** Did a vendor help develop this RFP and if so, are they eligible to bid?

**ANSWER:** We had a contracted Business Analyst come in and identify business requirements. The Vendor would be eligible to bid.

**QUESTION:** Is approval from a director always needed prior to launching a form package?

**ANSWER:** It is dependent on the department, how they are structured, and who in the program they wish to assign this role.