



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Project Title: Seattle Preschool Program Impact Evaluation

Procurement Schedule

Schedule of Events	Date/Time	Where
Solicitation Release	Wednesday, September 8, 2021	Department of Education and Early Learning website page: http://www.seattle.gov/education
Information Sessions	Wednesday September 15, 2021 Friday September 17, 2021 2:30-3:30 p.m. PST	Online Webinars Links to participate posted online: DEEL Funding Opportunities .
Q&A	Deadline to submit questions: Oct 5, 2021, 5:00 p.m. PST	E-mail all questions to DEELfunding@seattle.gov with "Question_SPP Impact Evaluation RFP" in subject line. Responses posted online: DEEL Funding Opportunities .
Proposal Submission Deadline	October 11, 2021 11:59 p.m. PST	RFP Submission instructions included in Section 6, pg. 9
Interviews	October 21 – 22, 2021	If applicable, Consultants will be contacted to schedule an online interview
Announcement of Successful Proposer(s)	Friday, November 12, 2021	
Anticipated Contract Negotiation Period	November 19 - December 3, 2021	
Contract Execution	Early January 2022	

The City reserves the right to modify this schedule.

Changes will be posted on the City's Funding Opportunities page on the DEEL website:

<http://www.seattle.gov/education/for-providers/funding-opportunities>

Table of Contents

1. Purpose and Background..... 3

2. Performance Schedule 4

3. Minimum Qualifications 5

4. Desired Qualifications 5

5. Scope of Work 6

6. Response Materials and Submittal..... 9

7. Selection Process 12

8. Award and Contract Execution 13

9. Contract Modifications 14

10. Procedures and Requirements 14

11. Reference Links 21

12. Data Collection Appendix 22

1. Purpose and Background

This Request for Proposal (RFP) seeks qualified consultants and/or researchers to assist the City of Seattle Department of Education and Early Learning (DEEL) in planning and conducting an Impact Evaluation of the Seattle Preschool Program. Specifically, DEEL is seeking a consultant to design a Multi-Year Impact Evaluation of the Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) and to execute the first two phases (24 months estimated) of the proposed Impact Evaluation. The maximum cost for this work is \$350,000.

The purpose of the impact evaluation solicitation is to:

1. Contract with an evaluation partner that can design, implement, and report on the impacts of the Seattle Preschool Program with a strong lens on impacts connected to racial equity, kindergarten readiness, and programmatic quality.
2. Inform the Department of Education and Early Learning of areas of programmatic strength and weakness to support the continuous quality improvement of the program.

A breakdown of desired consultant qualifications is detailed on page 5 of this solicitation along with an anticipated scope of work detailed on page 6.

About the Seattle Preschool Program

The mission of the Seattle Department of Education & Early Learning (DEEL), under the direction of Mayor Jenny Durkan, is to transform the lives of Seattle's children, youth, and families through strategic investments in education. The goal of the DEEL Early Learning Division is to provide children the opportunity to thrive in school and beyond by investing in early learning programs and activities that support children's kindergarten readiness. To realize DEEL's mission and achieve the Early Learning Division's goal, DEEL contracts with quality school- and community-based early learning partners with a focus on organizations that serve children from historically-marginalized populations.

The Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) launched in the 2015-16 school year with the goal of providing accessible, high-quality preschool services for Seattle children designed to improve their readiness for school and to support their subsequent academic achievement. Funded via the voter-approved Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) Levy, the first four years of SPP were designed to be a demonstration phase, wherein the City would establish sustainable practices to achieve its goal of eliminating race-based disproportionalities in kindergarten readiness.

The Seattle Preschool Program was reauthorized in the 2019-20 school year through the passage of the Families, Education, Preschool and Promise (FEPP) education levy. The levy funds the program through the 2025-26 school year. In School Year (SY) 21-22, Seattle Preschool Program will have approximately 2,000 seats available in 132 classrooms across 74 locations (sites), managed by 26 agencies. SPP will continue expanding over the life of the Levy, with the goal of reaching 2,500 seats and 165+ classrooms by SY 25-26. While expansion varies based on a number of annual factors, it is expected the program will add 80-100 slots annually over the next five years, or the equivalent of 4-6 new classrooms.

The Seattle Preschool Program is a mixed-delivery model that incorporates multiple types of service providers, including community based-organizations operating as child care centers, family child care (or family home) providers, and Seattle Public Schools. Approximately 70% of currently-enrolled children are Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and 33% speak a language other than English at home.

For more detailed information about the Seattle Preschool Program, please see our [SPP website](#) and [Dashboard](#).

Seattle Preschool Program Implementation and Evaluation

The work completed as a result of this solicitation is guided by the [Families, Education, Preschool and Promise \(FEPP\) Levy Implementation & Evaluation Plan](#). The Implementation & Evaluation Plan outlines core outcomes that guide FEPP Levy preschool and early learning investments. Target outcomes are detailed in the table below.

FEPP Levy Preschool and Early Learning Goal and Outcomes	
Goal	Seattle students have access to and utilize high-quality early learning services that promote success in kindergarten.
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children are kindergarten ready ^{C/Y} • Learning environments are evidence-based, high-quality, culturally responsive, and equitable ^P • Students and families have multiple ways to access high-quality early learning services ^S • Race-based opportunity gaps are closed ^S

*Outcomes are coded as S = System-level impact, P = Program-level impact, and C/Y – Child/youth-level impact

Through the Seattle Preschool Program, DEEL engages in the following strategies to pursue targeted early learning outcomes:

1. Preschool Services and Tuition Assistance: Provides access to free or affordable high-quality preschool, with a focus on meeting the needs of historically underserved populations.
2. Quality Teaching: Supports quality improvement through culturally-responsive professional development, coaching, and data-driven decision-making.
3. Comprehensive Support: Provides health supports and technical assistance to all partner preschool agencies and provides supplemental funding to partners to meet individualized needs of children and families.
4. Organizational and Facilities Development: Supports quality environments and sustainable business practices through facilities and business-related investments.

More detailed information about these strategies is available in the FEPP Levy Implementation & Evaluation Plan, pages 29 - 46. Please note that the FEPP Levy funds additional early learning investments stewarded by DEEL that fall outside the scope of Seattle Preschool Program and the impact evaluations addressed in this solicitation.

2. Performance Schedule

The work for this contract will take place from January 2022 through December 2023. There are three primary components of this evaluation: Multi-Year Impact Evaluation Design, Secondary Data Analysis (Evaluation 1), Impact Evaluation Implementation (Evaluation 2). This schedule may be altered based on discussions with the selected consultant and/or as part of the initial design phase.

Phase	Scope of Work Element	Anticipated Timing
Start-Up Phase	Contract Negotiation Period	November – Dec 2021
	Evaluation Start/Kickoff	Early January, 2022
Impact Evaluation Design Period (Phase 1)	Programmatic Data Review	January 2022
	Engagement with Evaluation Advisory Committee	January -February, 2022
	Deliverable: Approved Evaluation Plans	Early March, 2022
Evaluation 1 (Secondary Data Analysis) Implementation Period (Phase 2)	Data Analysis	March – July, 2022
	Engagement with Evaluation Advisory Committee	Ongoing
	Deliverable: Technical Report & Presentation	July 2022

Evaluation 2 Implementation Period (Phase 3)	Baseline Data Collection (as needed)	April – June 2022
	Deliverable (as finalized): Preliminary Report	September, 2022
	Continued/Post Data Collection	Sept. 2022 – June 2023
	Deliverables: Technical Report & Presentation	December, 2023

DEEL will structure the consultant agreement based on deliverables, not activities or time allotments. It is permissible to use effort to estimate cost, but the contract payments will be made upon receipt and approval of deliverables.

3. Minimum Qualifications

The City has minimum qualifications for a Consultant to be eligible to submit an RFP response. The submittal response must show compliance with these minimum qualifications. Submittals that are not responsive to these qualifications shall be rejected by the City without further consideration:

1. Consultant (or sub-consultant) has conducted evaluations related to the early childhood or education field within the last five years.
2. Consultant (or sub-consultant) has demonstrated experience designing and conducting evaluations that utilized a mixed-methods approach (integrated qualitative and quantitative methods).
3. Consultant (or sub-consultant) has knowledge and experience with culturally responsive evaluation practices, including demonstrated ability to conduct data collection approaches that deliver the perspectives of communities that have been historically marginalized in government policy, including: communities of color, linguistically-diverse communities, immigrant communities, and other communities that have experienced barriers to participation in public programs.
4. The selected consultant will need to show proof of the following business requirements:
 - WA State Business License
 - City of Seattle Business License
 - Insurance Documentation with general liability of at least \$1,000,000
 - An Acor Certificate of Insurance
 - Additional Insured Endorsement or Blanket Policy Wording showing the City of Seattle as an additional insured

These documents are not needed for the application process; however, they will be necessary during contract execution with the successful applicant.

4. Desired Qualifications

1. Consultant has expertise working on a project of similar size, scope, and budget with a government entity.
2. Consultant (or sub-consultant) has knowledge and experience conducting evaluations with an early learning focus that have included a rigorous, systematic quantitative methodology to assess program impact.
3. Consultant (or sub-consultant) has knowledge of and experience administering early learning executive function assessment tools (such as Teaching Standards Gold (TSG), Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery, etc.)
4. Consultant (or sub-consultant) demonstrates knowledge of and experience conducting early learning classroom observations.
5. Consultant has knowledge of the King County, WA early learning history, particularly as it relates to the expansion of publicly funded preschool.
6. Consultant demonstrates experience facilitating stakeholder engagement to inform study designs.

5. Scope of Work

The Scope of Work is described in three phases and expected to span 24 months in duration. For further background on the Seattle Preschool Program (including past evaluations), [Reference Links](#) and a [Data Collection Appendix](#) are included in this solicitation.

Phase 1: Impact Evaluation Designs

Design a cycle of three impact evaluations (one using existing data, two incorporating future data collection) that address outcomes outlined in the FEPP Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan. Components of the evaluation design process are detailed below.

	Key Elements of Phase 1
Timeline (estimated) January – March 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Review of Existing Data B. Stakeholder Engagement C. Secondary Data Analysis Design (Evaluation 1) D. Multi-Year Impact Evaluation Design (Evaluations 2 + 3)
Deliverable/s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder Engagement Plan • Secondary Data Analysis Design • Multi-Year Impact Evaluation Design

- A. Review of Existing Data:** Conduct a review of available programmatic data sources and documents related to Seattle Preschool Program in preparation for the evaluation design. Data that Consultant will have access to include child and program level assessment data from previous impact evaluations, in addition to assessment data that tracks student progress after they have graduated from SPP and move into the K-12 system. An overview of available data is detailed in the Data Collection Appendix in Section 13 (page 23) of this solicitation.
- B. Stakeholder Engagement:** Engage an Advisory Committee comprised of Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) stakeholders (including SPP program providers, families, community members, and DEEL staff) to inform the evaluation designs (Phases 1C and 1D described below). The Consultant should facilitate a stakeholder engagement strategy that centers relationship-building and cultural responsiveness. The interim deliverable for this stage is a Stakeholder Engagement Plan.
- C. Design Secondary Data Analysis (Evaluation 1):** Design a statistically rigorous longitudinal analysis using existing SPP data. The analysis should examine child, program, and system-level outcomes for the Seattle Preschool Program as outlined in the FEPP Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan. The Consultant will conduct the analysis and report of Evaluation 1 in Phase 2 of the contract Scope of Work.
- D. Multiyear Impact Evaluation Design (Evaluations 2 + 3):** Based on stakeholder input, design a multi-year impact evaluation that addresses outcomes outlined in the FEPP Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan. Research Questions will be informed by stakeholder engagement and finalized in partnership with DEEL staff. Both evaluation designs should address the same Research Questions and utilize a mixed-methods approach (integrated qualitative and quantitative methods).

Timeline

The multi-year evaluation design will include a timeline for two impact evaluation cycles, including data collection, analysis, and reporting from Spring 2022 to Fall 2025. The design will follow the Impact Evaluation schedule outlined below through remaining years of the FEPP Levy:

FEPP Levy Year	Evaluation Activity	Included in Contract Scope of Work
Y3: 2021-2022	Design: Impact Evaluations 1, 2, and 3	Yes
	Evaluation 1: Secondary Data Analysis & Report	Yes
	Evaluation 2: Baseline Data Collection	Yes
Y4: 2022-2023	Evaluation 2: Data collection, Analysis, & Report	Yes
Y5: 2023-2024	Evaluation 3: Planning & Baseline Data Collection	No
Y6: 2024-2025	Evaluation 3: Data Collection	No
Y7: 2025-2026	Evaluation 3: Analysis & Report (complete by September 2025 to inform policy decisions)	No

The Consultant will conduct data collection, analysis, and reporting for Evaluation 2 in Phase 3 of the contract Scope of Work. While the final impact evaluation cycle (Evaluation 3) falls outside the scope of this solicitation, the Consultant may have the opportunity to re-contract with DEEL in 2024 at DEEL’s discretion.

Areas of Evaluation and Example Questions:

The following questions are baseline questions DEEL anticipates exploring in the impact evaluation. Questions will be revised and finalized in collaboration with DEEL following stakeholder engagement (Phase 1B).

1. Child Level Outcomes
 - Do children show developmental progress and learning within SPP?
 - Are children ready for kindergarten?
 - Does SPP improve long-term school success?
2. Program Quality
 - Are families satisfied with SPP?
 - Do teachers meet qualifications, and does SPP help them meet qualifications?
 - Are classrooms meeting quality benchmarks, and does SPP help them improve?
 - Are classrooms culturally responsive, and does SPP help them improve?
3. System-Level Outcomes (population- and community-level impacts)
 - How has SPP contributed to the development of the early learning system in Seattle?

Data Collection

The evaluation design should take into account planned data collection (conducted by DEEL and contracted partners) and propose any additional child- and classroom-level assessments to address evaluation objectives.

Level of Analysis	Planned Assessments & Surveys (not included in this Contract)
Child-Level	TSG (preschool), WaKIDS (Kindergarten, longitudinal), SBA (K-12, longitudinal)
Program-Level	CLASS, Family Survey, Teacher Survey

Please refer to the Data Collection Appendix in Section 13 (page 23) of this solicitation for details regarding sampling expectations and timing of planned data collection. Note that planned data collection will occur outside the scope of this solicitation. The Consultant (and/or sub-consultant) should expect to conduct any proposed additional assessments, beyond the assessments listed in the table above, during evaluation implementation in Phase 3 of this Contract.

In recommending data collection protocols, particularly child and classroom-level assessments, Consultant should consider and plan to account for limitations and potential sources of bias. DEEL is particularly interested in executive functioning assessments have been developed with multi-cultural communities in mind. They should have been tested and normed on children and teachers of diverse racial and linguistic backgrounds.

Phase 2: Implement Evaluation 1 (Secondary Data Analysis)

Implement longitudinal impact analysis using according to design Phase 1C of the Scope of Work.

	Key Elements of Phase 2
Timeline: March-July 2022	A. Data Analysis B. Reporting
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Report • Community-Facing Brief • Power Point Summary Presentation

- A. Data Analysis:** As outlined in Phase 1C, conduct descriptive and a statistically rigorous longitudinal analysis to assess SPP impact at the child, program, and system level. The design selected will guide the data analysis.
- B. Reporting:** The Consultant will provide a series of deliverables in this phase of the evaluation. The final deliverable schedule can be negotiated as part of the contracting process. Currently, the DEEL will be expecting the following:
- **Technical Report** – Final summative report that includes an executive summary and provides a comprehensive overview of methods, findings, programmatic implications and data appendices.
 - **Community Facing Brief** – Brief, easily-digestible summary of evaluation findings designed to communicate results to SPP providers, families, and the general public.
 - **Power Point Summary Presentation** – The Consultant will summarize the main findings and conclusion from the technical report in a PowerPoint format for use in a public presentation. Audience includes the FEPP Levy Oversight Committee, City Leadership, and SPP Program Directors.

Phase 3: Implement Evaluation 2 (Data Collection, Analysis, & Reporting)

	Key Elements of Phase 3
Timeline: April 2022 – December 2023	A. Data Collection B. Analysis C. Reporting
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary Report • Final Technical Report • Community-Facing Brief • Presentation

- A. Data Collection:** Consultant (and/or sub-consultant) will implement data collection as outlined in their Multiyear Impact Evaluation Design (Phase 1D). DEEL anticipates that planning and baseline data collection (if applicable) for child- and program-level assessments will take place from April to June 2022, followed by additional data collection during the 2022-2023 school year. An alternative timeline for pre-post assessment may be recommended by the Consultant during the evaluation design phase.
- B. Data Analysis:** Timing and methods to be determined in Phase 1: Multiyear Impact Evaluation Design.
- C. Reporting:** The Consultant will produce a technical report, community-facing brief, and power-point summary presentation (as detailed in Scope of Work Phase 2B). The final deliverable schedule can be negotiated as part of the contracting process.

6. Response Materials and Submittal

Prepare your response as follows. Use the following format and provide all attachments. Failure to provide all information below on proper forms and in order requested may cause the City to reject your response.

1. Letter of interest (optional).

The following items are mandatory:

2. **Legal Name:** Submit a certificate, copy of web-page, or documentation from the Secretary of State in which you incorporated that shows your company's legal name. Many companies use a "Doing Business As" name or nickname in daily business; the City requires the legal name for your company. When preparing all forms below, use the proper company legal name. Your company's legal name can be verified through the State Corporation Commission in the state in which you were established; this is often located within the Secretary of State's Office for each state. For the State of Washington, see <http://www.secstate.wa.gov/corps/>
3. **Minimum Qualifications:** Provide a response limited to 2 pages that lists each Minimum Qualification listed on Page 5, and exactly how you achieve each minimum qualification. Remember that the determination you have achieved all the minimum qualifications is made from list described on this page. The Project Manager is not obligated to check references or search other materials to make this decision.
4. **Consultant Questionnaire:** Submit the following with your response, even if you sent the questionnaire in to the City for previous solicitations.



ConsultantQuestionnaire_5.1.2020.docx

5. **Proposal Response:** In addition to the required Documents 2, 3, and 4 above, please provide the following information in your proposal response. Please limit your proposal response to 10 double-sided pages and follow the Response Submission Instructions listed below. Your proposal should be comprehensible to an educated non-expert.
 - 5A: **Team Composition and Competencies:** Include a document listing all team members, including proposed partners and subcontractors, and their experiences and expertise related to this project. Please detail specific team members relative to each of the minimum and desired qualifications listed in Section 4, Minimum Qualifications, and Section 5, Desired Qualifications. *(Maximum three pages, minimum spacing 1.2 lines)*
 - 5B: **Anticipated Evaluation Approach:** Describe how you would approach the scope of work and addressing the evaluation questions. Also list any other evaluation questions you feel would strengthen the work, particularly in context of the recent environment for families with COVID-19 and the racial justice movement. In your description, please list team member roles as they pertain to the data collection, analysis and reporting. Lastly, please describe how you anticipate using a race and social justice lens in the work. *(Maximum six pages, minimum spacing 1.2 lines.)*
 - 5C: **Stakeholder Engagement:** Describe how you would engage a stakeholder group in an ongoing capacity to support the quality of evaluations. What considerations would you highlight in this process and describe any best practice approaches you expect to utilize. *(Maximum 1 page, minimum spacing 1.2 lines.)*

5D: Assessments and Data Collection protocols: Include a list of assessment tools you would consider using in the evaluation approach and please briefly describe their strengths and any notes related issues with cultural competency. Also, please briefly describe best practices in conducting assessments within preschool settings to minimize disruption and maintain cultural competency. *(Maximum 2 pages, minimum spacing 1.2 lines.)*

5E: Proposed Communications and Reporting Protocols: Include a description of how you would communicate the project status throughout the development of the deliverables to DEEL, and how you would present information to different target audiences specified in the Scope of Work. *(Maximum three pages, minimum spacing 1.2 lines)*

- 6. Cost Proposal.** Please submit a detailed budget that include hours by task and hourly rates for team members participating on the project. The maximum cost for this work is \$350,000. Additional funds may be made available at the discretion of the DEEL Project Manager.
- 7. Prior Work Samples.** Provide at least three samples of work related to the scope of this project. If sub-consultants are used, provide additional relevant work samples for each. We encourage samples that are most related to elements of the scope of work described in this RFP. Only electronic files or links to work will be accepted. Please provide at least one work sample that demonstrates a background in racial equity and at least one case study.
- 8. List of Professional References.** *For each team member* and sub-consultant, provide contact information for at least two professional references who can speak to the individual's experience doing work similar to the tasks assigned to this person in this proposal's work plan.

Package Checklist:

Package your response with each of the following items. This list assists with quality control before submittal of your final package. Addenda may change this list; check any final instructions before submitting:

1. Letter of Interest (optional)
2. Proof of Legal Name
3. Minimum Qualifications
4. Consultant Questionnaire (see embedded form)
5. Proposal Response (see Proposal Response Section, above)
6. Cost Proposal
7. Prior Work Samples
8. List of Professional References (two for each team member and sub-consultant)

Submitting Responses:

- Responses are due and ***must be received before*** 11:59 p.m. PST on October 11, 2021.

- **Electronic submission:**

Email to: DEELfunding@seattle.gov

Submit files only in MS Word or Adobe PDF or MS Excel. The 12-page maximum Proposal Response (items 5A-5E) should be submitted as one file.

Please use the following naming conventions:

- Email subject: **[Consultant Name] SPP Impact Evaluation Proposal**
 - Attached files: **[ConsultantName]_SPP Impact_Eval_Item#_Item**
For example: *StarConsulting_SPP_Impact_Eval_1_Letter of Interest*
- During this time of COVID-19 public health concerns, we highly encourage online submission of proposals; however, we will accommodate those who may need to submit by mail or by hand if online submission poses a barrier.

For deliveries by mail or by hand, please contact us at DEELFunding@seattle.gov for accommodations with a minimum of 1 full business day notice, as our offices are open to the public on a limited basis due to local public health guidelines

- **Submittal Questions:** DEELfunding@seattle.gov

7. Selection Process

7.1 Initial Screening: The City will review the Proof of Legal Name, Minimum Qualification Sheet, and Consultant Questionnaire responses for completeness and eligibility. Submittals found responsive and responsible based on this initial screening shall proceed to Step 2: Evaluating the Proposal Response, Cost Proposal, Prior Work Samples, and List of Professional References.

7.2 Proposal Evaluation: The City will evaluate proposals using the criteria below. Responses will be evaluated, scored, and ranked.

Evaluation Criteria:

Evaluation Area	Evaluation Criteria for Full Points	Scoring (Points)
Team Composition and Competencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The team meets or exceeds minimum qualifications The team meets or exceeds desired qualifications Team member roles in the project are clearly articulated and their backgrounds aligned with the roles they will play in the evaluation 	20
Anticipated Evaluation Approach	<p>Evaluation approach in the RFP proposal effectively:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outlines statistically rigorous methods to assess SPP impact at the child, program, and system level. Describes mixed methods data collection methodologies that address child-, program-, and system-level evaluation questions outlined in the Scope of Work. Includes assessments addressing child- and program-level outcomes that are reliable and well-regarded in public pre-K impact evaluations. Articulates any limitations or potential biases in methodologies outlined and how the Consultant would seek to minimize or control for them. Demonstrates a strong race and social justice focus in approaches to stakeholder engagement, data collection, analysis, and reporting. Demonstrates fluency with assessment tool options, public preschool programs and the evolution of the Seattle Preschool Program. Describes a timeline and process for delivering data reports and updates to DEEL and SPP providers to support quality improvements and strategic shifts 	40
Stakeholder Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outlines strategies to successfully engage key stakeholders in different phases of the evaluation Describes a utilization focused approach to sharing data and findings with DEEL staff and providers 	10
Cost Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs are clearly outlined for each phase of the project scope Costs appear to be reasonable and commensurate to the project plan 	10
Prior Work Samples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work samples are high-quality, provide actionable recommendations, demonstrate culturally responsive research practices, and are connected to the scope of work outlined in this RFP. Examples demonstrates ability to work with community-based organizations serving children and families. 	20

- 7.3 Interviews:** Consultants invited to interview are to bring the assigned Project Manager named in their Proposal and may bring other key personnel named in the Proposal. The proposed primary contact person for the contract should take the lead for the consultant team in the interview.
- 7.4 References:** The City may contact one or more references. The City may use references named or not named by the Proposer.
- 7.5 Selection:** The City shall select for award the highest ranked Proposer(s) based on their interview (if applicable) and written proposal.
- 7.6 Contract Negotiations:** The City may negotiate elements of the proposal as required to best meet the needs of the City, with the apparent successful Proposer. The City may negotiate any aspect of the proposal or the solicitation. The City does not intend to negotiate the City's Contract Boilerplate, which has been attached (see [Reference Links](#)).
- 7.7 Repeat of Evaluation:** If no Consultant is selected after the conclusion of all the steps, the City may return to any step in the process to repeat the evaluation with those proposals active at that step. The City shall then sequentially step through all remaining steps as if conducting a new evaluation process. The City reserves the right to terminate the process if no proposals meet its requirements.

8. Award and Contract Execution

DEEL will provide timely notice of an intent to award to all Consultants responding to the Solicitation.

8.1 Protests to Project Manager.

Interested parties that wish to protest any aspect of this RFP selection process must provide written notice to the City Project Manager for this solicitation. Note: the City shall notify the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) if a protest is received for a solicitation for contracts with FTA funds.

8.2 Protests – City Purchasing and Contracting Services.

The City has rules governing the rights and obligations of interested parties that desire to submit a complaint or protest to this process. Please see the City website at <http://www.seattle.gov/city-purchasing-and-contracting/consultant-contracting>. Interested parties have the obligation to know of and understand these rules, and to seek clarification from the City. Note there are time limits on protests, and submitters have final responsibility to learn of results in sufficient time for such protests to be filed in a timely manner.

8.3 Debriefs.

For a debrief, contact the City Project Manager.

8.4 Instructions to the Apparently Successful Consultant(s).

The Apparently Successful Consultant(s) will receive an Intent to Award Letter from the Project Manager after award decisions are made by the City. The Letter will include instructions for final submittals due prior to execution of the contract.

Once the City has finalized and issued the contract for signature, the Consultant must execute the contract and provide all requested documents within 10 business days. This includes attaining a Seattle Business License, payment of associated taxes due, and providing proof of insurance. If the Consultant fails to execute the contract with all documents within the 10-day time frame, the City may cancel the award and proceed to the next ranked Consultant, or cancel or reissue this solicitation. Cancellation of an award for failure to execute the Contract as attached may disqualify the firm from future solicitations for this same work.

8.5 Checklist of Final Submittals Prior to Award.

The Consultant(s) should anticipate the Intent to Award Letter will require at least the following documents. Consultants are encouraged to prepare these documents in advance, when possible, to eliminate risks of late compliance.

- Proof that Seattle Business License is current and all taxes due have been paid.
- State of Washington Business License.
- Certificate of Insurance
- Special Licenses (if any)

8.6 Taxpayer Identification Number and W-9.

Unless the Consultant has already submitted a Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification Request Form (W-9) to the City, the Consultant must execute and submit this form prior to the contract execution date.

<http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/fw9.pdf>

9. Contract Modifications

The City consultant contract is attached (See Section 11: [Reference Links](#)).

Consultants submit proposals understanding all Contract terms and conditions are mandatory. The submission of a Response is agreement to the Contract without exception. The City reserves the right to negotiate changes to submitted proposals and to change the City's otherwise mandatory Contract form during negotiations. If the Consultant is awarded a Contract and refuses to sign the attached Contract form, the City may reject the Consultant from this and future solicitations for the same work. Under no circumstances shall Consultant submit its own boilerplate of terms and conditions.

10. Procedures and Requirements

This section details City instructions and requirements for your submittal. The City reserves the right in its sole discretion to reject any Consultant response that fails to comply with the instructions.

10.1 Registration into City Registration System.

If you have not previously done so, register at: <http://www2.seattle.gov/ConsultantRegistration/>. The City expects all firms to register. Women- and minority- owned firms are asked to self-identify. For assistance, call 206-684-0444.

10.2 Information Sessions.

The City offers an optional information sessions at the time, date, and participation link on Page 1. Proposers are highly encouraged to attend but it is not required. Proposers will have the opportunity to ask clarifying questions or raise concerns about the solicitation.

10.3 Questions.

Proposers may submit written questions to DEELfunding@seattle.gov until the deadline stated on Page 1. Failure to request clarification of any inadequacy, omission, or conflict will not relieve the Consultant of responsibilities under in any subsequent contract. It is the responsibility of the interested Consultant to assure they receive issued responses to any questions.

10.4 Changes to the RFP/Addenda.

A change may be made by the City if, in the sole judgment of the City, the change will not compromise the City's objectives in this acquisition. A change to this RFP will be made by formal written addendum issued by the City's Project Manager. Addenda shall become part of this RFP and included as part of the Contract.

10.5 Receiving Addenda and/or Question and Answers.

It is the obligation and responsibility of the Consultant to learn of addenda, responses, or notices issued by the City. Some third-party services independently post City of Seattle solicitations on their websites. The City does not guarantee that such services have accurately provided all the information published by the City.

All submittals sent to the City may be considered compliant to all Addenda, with or without specific confirmation from the Consultant that an Addendum was received and incorporated, at the sole discretion of the Project Manager. The Project Manager may reject the submittal if it does not fully incorporate an Addendum.

10.6 Proposal Submittal.

- a. Proposals must be received into the City no later than the date and time on Page 1 except as revised by Addenda. The Proposer has full responsibility to ensure the response arrives at the City within the deadline. A response delivered after the deadline may be rejected unless waived as immaterial by the City given specific fact-based circumstances.
- b. All pages are to be numbered sequentially, and closely follow the requested formats.
- c. The City has page limits specified in the submittal instructions section. Any pages that exceed the page limit will be excised from the document for evaluation purposes.

Electronic Submittal.

Please e-mail documents to DEELfunding@seattle.gov by the deadline listed on Page 1 or as otherwise amended.

- a. Title the e-mail as indicated in section 6 so it won't be lost in an e-mail stream.
- b. Any risks associated with electronic submittal are borne by the Proposer.
- c. The City e-mail system will allow documents up to 20 megabytes.

10.7 License and Business Tax Requirements.

The Consultant must meet all applicable licensing requirements immediately after contract award or the City may reject the Consultant. Companies must license, report and pay revenue taxes for the Washington State Business License (UBI#) and Seattle Business License, if required by law. Carefully consider those costs before submitting an offer, as the City will not separately pay or reimburse such costs.

Seattle Business Licensing and associated taxes.

- a. If you have a "physical nexus" in the city, you must obtain a Seattle Business license and pay all taxes due before the Contract can be signed.
- b. A "physical nexus" means you have physical presence, such as: a building/facility in Seattle, you make sales trips into Seattle, your own company drives into Seattle for product deliveries, and/or you conduct service work in Seattle (repair, installation, service, maintenance work, on-site consulting, etc.).
- c. We provide a Consultant Questionnaire Form in our RFP submittal package; it will ask you to specify if you have "physical nexus."
- d. All costs for any licenses, permits and Seattle Business License taxes owed shall be borne by the Consultant and not charged separately to the City.
- e. The apparent successful Consultant(s) must immediately obtain the Seattle Business License and ensure all City taxes are current, unless exempted by City Code due to reasons such as no physical nexus. Failure to do so will cause rejection of the submittal.
- f. Self-Filing: You can pay your license and taxes on-line using a credit card. <https://dea.seattle.gov/self/>
- g. For questions and assistance, call the Revenue and Consumer Protection (RCP) office which issues business licenses and enforces licensing requirements. The general e-mail is rca@seattle.gov. The main phone is 206-684-8484.
- h. The City of Seattle licensing website is <http://www.seattle.gov/rca/taxes/taxmain.htm>.
- i. If a business has extraordinary balances due on their account such that paying them would cause undue hardship to the business, the business can contact the RCA office to request additional assistance. A

cover-sheet providing further explanation with the application and instructions for a Seattle Business License is provided below.

- j. Those holding a City of Seattle Business license may be required to report and pay revenue taxes to the City. Such costs should be carefully considered by the Consultant prior to submitting your offer. When allowed by City ordinance, the City will have the right to retain amounts due at the conclusion of a contract by withholding from final invoice payments.

State Business Licensing. Before the contract is signed, you must have a State of Washington business license (a “Unified Business Identifier” known as a UBI#). If the State of Washington has exempted your business from State licensing (some foreign companies are exempt and sometimes the State waives licensing because the company has no physical presence in the State), then submit proof of that exemption to the City. All costs for any licenses, permits and associated tax payments due to the State because of licensing shall be borne by the Consultant and not charged separately to the City. Instructions and applications are at <http://bls.dor.wa.gov/file.aspx> and the State of Washington Department of Revenue is available at 1-800-647-7706.

Federal Excise Tax. The City is exempt from Federal Excise Tax (Certificate of Registry #9173 0099K exempts the City).

10.8 Proposer Responsibility to Provide Full Response.

It is the Proposer’s responsibility to submit a proposal that does not require interpretation or clarification by the City. The Proposer is to provide all requested materials, forms and information. The Proposer is to ensure the materials submitted properly and accurately reflect the Proposer’s offering. During scoring and evaluation (prior to interviews if any), the City will rely upon the submitted materials and shall not accept materials from the Proposer after the RFP deadline; this does not limit the City’s right to consider additional information (such as references not provided by the Proposer but known to the City, or past City experience with the consultant), or to seek clarifications as needed.

10.9 No Guaranteed Utilization.

The City does not guarantee utilization of this contract. The solicitation may provide estimates of utilization; such information is for Consultant convenience and not a usage guarantee. The City reserves the right to multiple or partial awards, and/or to order work based on City needs. The City may turn to other appropriate contract sources or supplemental contracts to obtain these same or similar services. The City may re-solicit for new additions to the Consultant pool. Use of such supplemental contracts does not limit the right of the City to terminate existing contracts for convenience or cause.

10.10 Expansion Clause.

The contract limits expansion of scope and new work not expressly provided for within the RFP.

Expansion for New Work (work not specified within the original Scope of Work section of this Agreement, and/or not specified in the original RFP as intended work for the Agreement) must comply with the following: (a) New Work is not reasonable to solicit separately; (b) is for reasonable purposes; (c) was not reasonably known by the City or Consultant at time of solicitation, or was mentioned as a possibility in the solicitation (e.g., future phases of work, or a change in law); (d) is not significant enough to be regarded as an independent body of work; (e) would not attract a different field of competition; and (f) does not vary the identity or purpose of the Agreement. The City may make exceptions for immaterial changes, emergency or sole source conditions, or other situations required in City opinion. Certain changes are not subject to these limitations, such as additional phases of Work anticipated during solicitation, time extensions, and Work Orders issued on an On-Call contract. Expansion must be mutually agreed and issued by the City through written Addenda. New Work performed before an authorizing Amendment may not be eligible for payment.

10.11 Right to Award to next ranked Consultant.

If a contract is executed resulting from this solicitation and is terminated within 90-days, the City may return to the solicitation process to award to the next highest ranked responsive Consultant, by mutual agreement with such Consultant. New awards thereafter are also extended this right.

10.12 Negotiations.

The City may open discussions with the apparent successful Proposer, to negotiate costs and modifications to align the proposal or contract to meet City needs within the scope sought by the solicitation.

10.13 Effective Dates of Offer.

Solicitation responses are valid until the City completes award. Should any Proposer object to this condition, the Proposer must object prior to the Questions deadline on page 1.

10.14 Cost of Preparing Proposals.

The City is not liable for costs incurred by the Proposer to prepare, submit or present proposals, interviews and/or demonstrations.

10.15 Readability.

The City's ability to evaluate proposals is influenced by the organization, detail, comprehensiveness of materials and readable format of the response.

10.16 Changes or Corrections to Proposal Submittal.

Prior to the submittal due date, a Consultant may change its proposal, if initialed and dated by the Consultant. No changes are allowed after the closing date and time.

10.17 Errors in Proposals.

Proposers are responsible for errors and omissions in their proposals. No error or omission shall diminish the Proposer's obligations to the City.

10.18 Withdrawal of Proposal.

A proposal may be withdrawn by written request of the Proposer.

10.19 Rejection of Proposals.

The City may reject any or all proposals with no penalty. The City may waive immaterial defects and minor irregularities in any submitted proposal.

10.20 Incorporation of RFP and Proposal in Contract.

This RFP and Proposer's response, including promises, warranties, commitments, and representations made in the successful proposal once accepted by the City, are binding and incorporated by reference in the City's contract with the Proposer.

10.21 Independent Contractor.

The Consultant works as an independent contractor. The City will provide appropriate contract management, but that does not constitute a supervisory relationship to the consultant. Consultant workers are prohibited from supervising City employees or from direct supervision by a City employee. Prohibited supervision tasks include conducting a City of Seattle Employee Performance Evaluation, preparing and/or approving a City of Seattle timesheet, administering employee discipline, and similar supervisory actions.

Contract workers shall not be given City office space unless expressly provided for below, and in no case shall such space be provided for over 36 months without specific authorization from the City Project Manager.

The City will not provide space in City offices for performance of this work. Consultants will perform most work from their own office space or the field.

10.22 Equal Benefits.

Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 20.45 (SMC 20.45) requires consideration of whether Proposers provide health and benefits that are the same or equivalent to the domestic partners of employees as to spouses of employees, and of their dependents and family members. The Consultant Questionnaire requested in the Submittal instructions includes materials to designate your equal benefits status.

10.23 Women and Minority Subcontracting.

The Mayor's Executive Order and City ordinance require the maximum practicable opportunity for successful participation of minority and women-owned subcontractors. All proposers must agree to SMC Chapter 20.42, and seek meaningful subcontracting opportunities with WMBE firms. The City requires a plan for including minority- and women-owned firms, which becomes a material part of the contract. The Plan must be responsive in the opinion of the City, which means a meaningful and successful search and commitments to include WMBE firms for subcontracting work. The City reserves the right to improve the Plan with the winning Consultant before contract execution. Consultants should use selection methods and strategies sufficiently effective for successful WMBE participation. At City request, Consultants must furnish evidence such as copies of agreements with WMBE subcontractors either before contract execution or during contract performance. The winning Consultant must request written approval for changes to the Inclusion Plan once it is agreed upon. This includes changes to goals, subconsultant awards and efforts.

10.24 Insurance Requirements.

Any special insurance requirements are provided as an Attachment. If attached, provide proof of insurance to the City before Contract execution; the City will remind the apparent successful Proposer of this in the Intent to Award letter. The apparent successful Proposer must promptly provide proof of insurance to the City Project Manager.

Consultants are encouraged to immediately contact their Broker to begin preparation of the required insurance documents if the Consultant is selected as a finalist. Proposers may elect to provide the requested insurance documents within their Proposal.

10.25 Proprietary and Confidential Material.

Under Washington State Law (reference RCW Chapter 42.56, the *Public Records Act*) all materials received or created by the City of Seattle are **public records**. These records include but are not limited to bid or proposal submittals, agreement documents, contract work product, or other bid material. Some records or portions of records are legally *exempt from disclosure* and can be redacted or withheld. The Public Records Act (RCW 42.56 and RCW 19.108) describes those exemptions. Proposers must familiarize themselves with the Washington State Public Records Act (PRA) and the City of Seattle's process for managing records.

The City will try to redact anything that seems obvious in the City's opinion for redaction. For example, the City will black out (redact) Social Security Numbers, federal tax identifiers, and financial account numbers before records are made viewable by the public. However, this does not replace your own obligations to identify any materials you wish to have redacted or protected, and that you think are so under the Public Records Act (PRA).

Protecting your Materials from Disclosure (Protected, Confidential, or Proprietary)

You must determine and declare any materials you want exempted (redacted), and that you also believe are eligible for redaction. This includes, but is not limited to, your bid submissions, contract materials and work products. Proposers must familiarize themselves with the Washington State Public Records Act (PRA) and the City of Seattle's process for managing records.

How to Identify Materials You Consider Exempt from Disclosure

Proposal Submittals

If you wish to assert exemptions in the materials in your proposal related to its proprietary nature per RCW 42.56.270, you must clearly identify your exemption request in the Vendor Questionnaire in the Non-Disclosure Request Section.

Contract Work Products

If you wish to assert exemptions for your contract work products, you must clearly and specifically notify the City Project Manager at the time such records are generated.

Please note that the City cannot accept and will not honor a generic marking of materials, such as marking everything with a document header or footer, page stamp, or a generic statement that a document is non-disclosable, exempt, confidential, proprietary, or protected. You may not exempt an entire page unless each sentence is entitled to exemption; instead, identify paragraphs or sentences that meet the RCW exemption criteria you are relying upon.

City's Response to a Public Records Act Requests

The City will prepare two versions of your materials:

(Full Redaction) A public copy that redacts (blacks out) standard exemptions as required by the PRA and the materials or text that you identified as exempt.

(Limited Redaction) A copy that redacts (blacks out) only the standard exemptions required by the PRA, but does not redact (black out) the exemptions you identified.

The fully redacted version is made public upon contract execution and will be supplied without any notification to you.

The Limited Redaction will be released only after you have received "third party notice" that allows you the legal right under RCW 42.56.540 to bring a legal action to enjoin the release of any records you believe are not subject to disclosure.

If the original requestor wants to see the Limited Redacted or original versions, the City will provide you with "third party notice". You will then have ten business days to obtain a temporary restraining order while you pursue a court injunction. A judge will determine the status of your exemptions and the Public Records Act.

Requesting Disclosure of Public Records

The City asks proposers and their companies to refrain from requesting public disclosure of proposal records until an intention to award is announced. This shelters the solicitation process, particularly during evaluation and selection or if a cancellation occurs with re-solicitation. With this preference stated, the City will continue to respond to all requests for disclosure of public records as required by State Law.

10.26 Ethics Code.

Please familiarize yourself with the City Ethics code: http://www.seattle.gov/ethics/etpub/et_home.htm.

Attached is a pamphlet for Consultants, Customers and Clients, visit:

<http://www.seattle.gov/ethics/etpub/fagcontractorexplan.htm>. Any questions should be addressed to Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission at 206-684-8500.

No Gifts and Gratuities.

Consultants shall not directly or indirectly offer anything (such as retainers, loans, entertainment, favors, gifts, tickets, trips, favors, bonuses, donations, special discounts, work, or meals) to any City employee, volunteer or official, if it is intended or may appear to a reasonable person to be intended to obtain or give special consideration to the Consultant. An example is giving a City employee sporting event tickets to a City employee on the evaluation team of a solicitation to which you submitted. The definition of

what a “benefit” would be is broad and could include not only awarding a contract but also the administration of the contract or evaluating contract performance. The rule works both ways, as it also prohibits City employees from soliciting items from Consultants. Promotional items worth less than \$25 may be distributed by the Consultant to City employees if the Consultant uses the items as routine and standard promotions for the business.

No Conflict of Interest.

Consultant (including officer, director, trustee, partner or employee) must not have a business interest or a close family or domestic relationship with any City official, officer or employee who was, is, or will be involved in selection, negotiation, drafting, signing, administration or evaluating Consultant performance. The City shall make sole determination as to compliance.

Involvement of Current and Former City Employees.

The Consultant Questionnaire within your submittal documents prompts you to disclose any current or former City employees, official or volunteer that is working or assisting on solicitation of City business or on completion of an awarded contract. Update that information during the contract.

Contract Workers with over 1,000 Hours.

The Ethics Code applies to Consultant workers that perform over 1,000 cumulative hours on any City contract during any 12-month period. Any such employee must abide by the City Ethics Code. The Consultant is to be aware and familiar with the Ethics Code accordingly.

10.27 Background Checks and Immigrant Status.

The City has strict policies regarding the use of background checks, criminal checks and immigrant status for contract workers. The policies are incorporated into the contract and available for viewing on-line at <http://www.seattle.gov/business/WithSeattle.htm>

11. Reference Links

Seattle Preschool Program and Evaluation Context:

- FEPP Levy Implementation & Evaluation Plan:
<http://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/DEEL/FEPP%20Levy%20Implementation%20and%20E%20valuation%20Plan.pdf>
- SPP Impact Evaluation, National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) - 2015-19:
<https://nieer.org/research-report/seattle-pre-k-program-evaluation>
- SPP Process Evaluation, School Readiness Consulting (SRC) – 2019:
http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/DEEL/FundingOpportunities/RFPs/2021/SPP_Process_EvaluationReport_SchoolReadinessConsulting_2019.pdf
- City of Seattle Race and Social Justice Initiative:
<http://www.seattle.gov/rsji/>
- Department of Education and Early Learning Seattle Preschool Program Overview:
<http://www.seattle.gov/education/overview>
- For more detailed information about the Seattle Preschool Program Dashboard:
<http://www.seattle.gov/education/overview/accessible-and-affordable>

Proposal Submission and Contracting References:

- Consultant Questionnaire:
http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/DEEL/FundingOpportunities/RFPs/2021/ConsultantQuestionnaire_5_1_2020.docx
- Insurance Requirements:
<http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/DEEL/FundingOpportunities/RFPs/2021/InsuranceRequirements.pdf>
- Consultant Agreement Boilerplate:
https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/DEEL/FundingOpportunities/RFPs/2021/ConsultantAgreement_Boilerplate.docx
- W-9:
http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/DEEL/FundingOpportunities/RFPs/2021/W9_RevOctober2018.pdf

12. DATA COLLECTION APPENDIX

A. Distribution of SPP Program Delivery Models

The successful respondent should propose a sampling strategy that represents the following program models:

Table A1: Distribution of SPP Program Delivery Models

Agency Type	Program Focus	Classroom Count (SY 21-22)
Family Child Care Center	none	24
Community Based Organization	Dual Language	27
	Special Education Inclusion	3
	none	44
Seattle Public Schools	Dual Language	1
	Special Education Inclusion	18
	none	15
GRAND TOTAL		132

“Dual Language” classrooms provide instruction in 2 or more languages. “Special Education Inclusion” classrooms include children whose IEPs would qualify them for developmental preschool as well as students without IEPs. All classrooms may serve children with different linguistic and developmental backgrounds, but these classrooms make it a focus.

B. Current SPP Data Sources (Past and Planned Data Collection)

Table B1, below, provides an overview of existing SPP data sources that the successful applicant will have access to, including a schedule of historical and planned data collection. Measures are coded as **P = Program-level**, and **C/Y = Child/youth-level**. Data source descriptions are provided in Table B2.

Please note that planned future data collection outlined in Table B1 will occur outside the scope of this solicitation. The evaluation implementation conducted in Phase 3 of the Scope of Work may include additional assessments performed by the Consultant (and/or sub-consultant).

Table B1: Seattle Preschool Program Child- and Program-Level Data Schedule

Shaded Assessments happen during SPP; unshaded assessments happen once they enter school; all raw data available for longitudinal analysis.

Cohorts*	Cohort A	Cohort B	Cohort C	Cohort D	Cohort E	Cohort F	Cohort G	Cohort H	Cohort I	Cohort J	Cohort K
	SPP Levy				FEPP Levy						
Year	SY 15-16	SY 16-17	SY 17-18	SY 18-19	SY 19-20 (cut short by COVID)	SY 20-21 (incl. hybrid/remote)	SY 21-22	SY 22-23	SY 23-24	SY 24-25	SY 25-26
# Classrooms	15	34	65	87	105	112	129-132	138 (goal)	147 (goal)	156 (goal)	165 (goal)
# Children	275	600	920	130	1550	1550	2000 (goal)	2175 (goal)	2250 (goal)	2375 (goal)	2500 (goal)
CLASS ^P	n=15	n=39	n=61	n=84	n=74	n=12	~60 planned	~60 planned	~60 planned	~60 planned	~60 planned
ECERS ^P	n=15	n=39	n=61	n=73				TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TSG ^{C/Y}	Fall, Winter, Spring	Fall, Winter, Spring	Fall, Winter, Spring	Fall, Winter, Spring	Fall Only	Some Fall and Winter, All Spring	Fall, Spring	Fall, Spring	Fall, Spring	Fall, Spring	Fall, Spring
Child-level assessments	SAMPLE: PPVT, WJ-III, Dimensional Change Card Sort Task, Peg Tapping Test	SAMPLE: PPVT, WJ-III, Dimensional Change Card Sort Task, Peg Tapping Test	SAMPLE: PPVT, WJ-III, Dimensional Change Card Sort Task, Peg Tapping Test	SAMPLE: PPVT, WJ-III, Dimensional Change Card Sort Task, Peg Tapping Test	All children: PPVT (Fall only)		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Family Survey ^P	n= 224	n= 320	n= 672	n= 734	none	n= 610	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Teacher Survey ^P					n=93		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SPP Attendance Data ^{C/Y}	None	None	None	Yes	Yes	Data quality affected by COVID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Year	SY 15-16	SY 16-17	SY 17-18	SY 18-19	SY 19-20 (cut short by COVID)	SY 20-21 (incl. hybrid/ remote)	SY 21-22	SY 22-23	SY 23-24	SY 24-25	SY 25-26
WaKIDS ^{C/Y}			Cohort B (n=332 SPP/ 4090 non- SPP)	Cohort C (n=460 SPP/3,956 non-SPP)	Cohort D (n=653 SPP/ 3,752 non- SPP)	Cohort E (limited administrati on, n=182 SPP/ 2,990 non- SPP)	Cohort F	Cohort G	Cohort H	Cohort I	Cohort J
SBA ^{C/Y}	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Cohort B (3rd in fall, 4th in spring) Cohort C (3rd in spring)	Cohort A, 6 th Cohort B, 5 th Cohort C, 4 th Cohort D, 3rd	Cohort A, 7 th Cohort B, 6 th Cohort C, 5 th Cohort D, 4 th Cohort E, 3rd	Cohort A, 8 th Cohort B, 7 th Cohort C, 6 th Cohort D, 5 th Cohort E, 4 th Cohort F, 3rd	Cohort B, 8 th Cohort C, 7 th Cohort D, 6 th Cohort E, 5 th Cohort F, 4 th Cohort G, 3rd

Measures are coded as **P = Program-level**, and **C/Y = Child/youth-level**.

*Cohorts refer to children’s last year in preschool. However, each year’s total child enrollment includes 3-year-olds who are members of the following school year’s Cohort. Example: about a third of Cohort B started as 3-year-olds in SY 15-16. All children enrolled in a year get the same SPP assessments, but their school-age assessments (WaKIDS and SBA) will be based on when they were 4.

Table B2: SPP Data Source Information

Data Source	Definition
CLASS	Classroom Assessment Scoring System Pre-K (CLASS Pre-K). This is conducted yearly by Cultivate Learning at University of Washington and will continue under that partnership.
ECERS	Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale—Third Ed. (ECERS-3)
Child-level assessments	From 2015 to 2019, SPP children were assessed using a measure of receptive language (the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test—Fourth Edition or PPVT-IV), emerging literacy (the letter-word identification subtest from the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery—Third Edition, or WJ-III) and mathematics (the applied problems subtest from the WJ-III). In addition, children were assessed with two measures of executive functions, which capture children’s inhibitory control, short term memory and attention. These are the Dimensional Change Card Sort Task (DCCS) and the Peg Tapping Test (PT). Additional details can be found in the attached 2019 SPP Impact Evaluation Report, conducted by the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER).

Family Survey	The family survey collects feedback from families about family engagement, satisfaction with SPP, and input on growth they observed in their children.
Teacher Survey	The teacher survey, administered by DEEL, includes questions about teacher experiences in SPP, retention-related indicators, and satisfaction with SPP and SPP supports (particularly coaches).
TSG	Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG) is a formative assessment that looks at 6 domains up to three times a year and compares them to "Widely Held Expectations" for children their age. SPP teachers collect observations and score the children. SPP teachers are required to attain inter-rater reliability certification. Previously required three times per year, Winter administration of TSG was made optional in SY 2019-20.
WaKIDS	The Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS) is administered by Kindergarten teachers in October of the Kindergarten year. WaKIDS assesses incoming kindergartners' readiness in six domains: social emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy and math. Kindergarten readiness is based on readiness in all six domains. It uses a sub-set of the constructs used in Teaching Strategies Gold. Through a data sharing agreement with Seattle Public Schools, DEEL receives annual WaKIDS scores for all kindergarteners with detailed student-level demographics, including flags for previous SPP students for longitudinal tracking.
SBA	Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBA) are summative assessments in English language arts/literacy and math given in Spring to 3rd-8th graders. In 21-22 ONLY, SPS will give the last year's grade-level assessment in Fall to make up for the missing SY 20-21 data. SBAs were not conducted in SY 19-20. Through a data sharing agreement with Seattle Public Schools, DEEL receives annual SBA scores for all SPS students, with detailed student-level demographics and flags for previous SPP students for longitudinal tracking.