

## Addendum #2

### RFP #WRESA-38-2025-2026-05 GSRP Implementation Manual

#### Questions and Answers

**Q.1.** Do we need to include or acknowledge addendums (with a signature) in our proposal submission?

**A.1.** No, including acknowledged addendums (with a signature) with your proposal submission is not necessary.

**Q.2.** Are scanned copies of notarized documents acceptable for Attachments #4 & #5? If not, how should we include these notarized documents in our proposal?

**A.2.** Yes, scanned copies are acceptable.

**Q.3.** If we choose to include brochures or other similar material, where should they appear in the order of documents?

**A.3.** You may add brochures or other similar material at the end of your proposal or include as separate attachments.

**Q.4.** Can we include a Table of Contents in our proposal?

**A.4.** Yes, you may include a Table of Contents in your proposal.

**Q.5.** Are there any formatting requirements (font type, font size, line spacing, margins, etc.) for Sections 1.0 – 5.0 of the proposal?

**A.5.** There are no specific formatting requirements for any section of the proposal. However, it must be readable.

**Q.6.** In the Letter of Transmittal, should the Account Executive Contact be someone from the project team?

**A.6.** The Account Executive should be the individual who is authorized to sign and bind the firm/company.

**Q.7.** If we request an exception to an item in the "Terms and Conditions for Consortium Solicitations" document, but that term isn't listed in Attachment #8 how (and in which part of the proposal) should we detail that exception?

**A.7.** Since this is not a Consortium Solicitation, the only terms for this are listed in Attachment #8.

**Q.8.** Section 1.0, C states, “The term of the resultant contract shall be for one (1) year with the option to renew for one (1) additional year. Do you anticipate requiring an additional year to accommodate the potential review and approval process for each product, or an additional year to create ad-hoc products (additional scope of work) based on user feedback?”

**A.8.** The option year is only if we run into issues and the Contract needs to be extended. No additional scope of work may be added.

**Q.9.** When proposed, should we propose a 1-year project with a 1-year budget?

**A.9.** You should propose the project according to the phases, not a specific timeframe, as we do not know how long the entire project will take. You may propose a timeline, including the phases, within your proposal.

**Q.10.** Do you have a budget range in mind for this project?

**A.10.** Wayne RESA does not have a budget range for this project.

**Q.11.** The RFP describes the current implementation manual as repetitive, difficult to navigate, and unclear in distinguishing between mandatory requirements and recommendations. Can you clarify how these issues were identified?

Was this assessment based on internal review, or has direct feedback been gathered from ISDs or licensed centers?

If feedback has been collected, was this through informal avenues (e.g., anecdotal reports, verbal feedback, or complaints from ISDs or licensed centers) or a structured data collection approach (e.g., surveys, focus groups, interviews)?

**A.11.** This feedback is from the GSRP consultant team who uses the manual to provide guidance and has encountered repetitiveness throughout. The ISDs have communicated to us during monthly state calls that finding the answer can be difficult, so they just call the consultant and then it circles back to the first statement. The ISDs, during those same calls, are who recommended we separate out what are the legislative and MiLEAP requirements and what is guidance for best practice. All feedback has been verbal or based on our teams personal use of the document.

**Q.12.** Can you clarify the distinction between the redesigned implementation manual and the companion guide? Specifically: What is the primary purpose of each document? Who is the intended audience for each document? How will each document be used in practice?

**A.12.** The primary purpose of the Implementation Manual is to include ALL requirements and guidance, for both the ISDs and the subrecipients. The idea is that the ISD needs to know what is required of themselves and those they partner with. The

companion guide is so the subrecipients/partners know what their requirements are versus what are ISD requirements.

**Q.13.** When the RFP references publishing documents electronically, does this mean PDF format?

**A.13.** Yes, it would be in PDF format that is ADA compliant.

**Q.14.** The RFP mentions that key sections must be formatted for easy printing. Does this refer to everyday office printing (e.g., PDFs optimized for standard printers), or do professional printing standards need to be considered (e.g., margins and bleed)? The “key sections” formatted for easy printing are they intended to be developed as standalone printable documents or simply designed to be easily printable within the larger document? What is the rationale for requiring only “key sections” of the manual to be print-friendly rather than the entire manual?

**A.14.** Everyday office printing is preferred as many ISDs will print sections for training and the subrecipients/partners print some sections for direct reference in their classrooms. They could be either standalone (this is how they currently are) or easily printable within the larger document. The standalone sections is what the field is currently used to and using. We don’t often find that the entire document is printed due to its length and continuous updates. Often, the key sections like classroom quality, ECS, program administration and staffing sections are all printed and used to support the programs with implementation. The companion document should be created in a manner that the entire document could be printed as we anticipate it to be much shorter in length than the entire Implementation Manual.

**Q.15.** Will any training or support be needed to help ISDs or centers understand and use the redesigned implementation manual and/or companion guide?

**A.15.** The GSRP team will need training on how to use the redesigned manual and guide. The GSRP team can then train the field on how to use it.

**Q.16.** The RFP mentions the manual must comply with ADA standards for accessibility. Since there are no specific technical standards in the ADA, does this mean the WCAG 2.1 Level AA is the desired compliance level?

What final accessibility checker reports will be sufficient proof for testing and compliance?

**A.16.** WCAG 2.1 is the state standard. Detailed State of Michigan Digital Standards can be found here: [SOM Digital Standards](#)