

WESTPORT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW

RFP #27-003-RFP | July 31, 2026

This RFP is issued only to respondents shortlisted through Westport Public Schools RFQ #26-025-RFQ. The District will consider each respondent's RFQ submission and RFP response together during the final selection process.

District Contact

Tom Scarice, Superintendent of Schools
Elio Longo, Chief Financial Officer
Westport Public Schools | 110 Myrtle Avenue | Westport, CT 06880

Procurement Schedule

The following schedule is tentative. The District may modify it by written addendum.

Milestone	Tentative Date
RFP issued to shortlisted respondents	July 31, 2026
Deadline for written questions	August 21, 2026 days
District responses/addendum issued	Within 3 days of receipt
Proposal submission deadline	September 1, 2026
Finalist interviews/presentations, if held	October 1, 2026
Notice of intent to award/BOE Approval	October 15, 2026
Anticipated contract approval	October 23, 2026 days
Anticipated project kickoff	November 2, 2026
Required completion window	Four to six months from kickoff

1. Invitation and Purpose

Westport Public Schools (the "District") invites the shortlisted respondents from RFQ #26-025-RFQ to submit detailed proposals to conduct a comprehensive, independent, system-level review of the District's PK-12 special education programs and services, including transition and 18-22 programming where applicable.

The review is intended to move beyond procedural compliance and examine whether the District's continuum of services is aligned to student needs, supports placement in the least restrictive environment ("LRE"), is delivered with fidelity and consistency, produces meaningful outcomes and experiences for students, and uses human and financial resources effectively. The selected respondent will provide evidence-based findings and a focused set of practical, prioritized recommendations.

This proposal phase follows a qualifications process. Information submitted in response to the RFQ is incorporated by reference. Respondents shall identify any material changes to their organization, proposed team, availability, qualifications, subcontractors, or representations made in the RFQ response.

2. District Context and Guiding Purpose

The District has invested in a broad continuum of supports across grade levels and programs, including early identification and RTI/MTSS structures, inclusive instructional settings, resource and intensive supports, related services, emotional/behavioral and mental-health supports, specialized programming, and transition/18-22 services. The District seeks an external partner to determine whether these supports are coherent, appropriately aligned to student needs, implemented consistently across schools, supportive of LRE, and associated with positive academic, behavioral, social/emotional, and transition-related outcomes. The District is interested in resource allocation and cost-effectiveness only as part of the broader program-effectiveness review.

The District currently includes one preschool, five elementary schools, two middle schools, one high school, and one transition program. Intensive programs exist at multiple levels. The review must include all school levels and all major program types; respondents shall propose an observation and sampling plan that provides sufficient building and program coverage to support reliable system-level conclusions.

Community feedback has emphasized family satisfaction and communication; IEP service-delivery fidelity; outplacement criteria, trends, and costs; resource allocation; early identification and intervention; cross-school consistency; training and support for paraeducators and other staff; mental-health and behavioral supports; access to classes, electives, extracurricular and nonacademic opportunities; and transitions across levels.

3. Mandatory Proposal Commitments

A proposal may be considered nonresponsive if it does not clearly commit to each of the following:

- Completion of the full review, final report, and presentation within four to six months from kickoff. Respondents can identify contingency plans to address if the review extends beyond this timeline.
- Design, administration, analysis, disaggregation, and reporting of a districtwide survey of all families of students with disabilities and a districtwide survey of staff who teach, support, supervise, or make decisions affecting students with disabilities.
- Onsite visits and observations that cover all school levels and all major program types, including specialized and transition/18-22 programming where applicable.
- Interviews, focus groups, or listening sessions with a balanced set of central office leaders, school administrators, special education and general education teachers, related service providers, paraeducators, mental-health/behavior staff, students where appropriate and approved, and families
- Assignment of named key personnel, including at least one individual with substantial special education leadership experience; key personnel substitutions require prior District approval.
- FERPA-aligned data handling, aggregate/de-identified reporting, and findings focused on system patterns rather than individual cases or personnel.
- A final report, executive summary, Board of Education presentation, and prioritized recommendations,
- A complete, transparent fee proposal submitted separately from the technical proposal.

4. Guiding Review Questions

Respondents may refine the questions collaboratively with the District, but the proposed methodology must be capable of addressing at least the following:

1. To what extent is the District's PK-12 continuum of services, including transition/18-22 programming sufficient, consistently understood, and aligned to student needs?
2. To what extent do early intervention, MTSS/RTI, referral, evaluation, IEP development, placement, and progress-monitoring practices support appropriate and timely services?
3. To what extent are services and supports described in IEPs implemented consistently and effectively at the system level?
4. How effectively does the continuum support LRE, inclusion, access to curriculum and extracurricular experiences, and student progress?
5. What patterns are evident in academic, behavioral, social/emotional, graduation, and transition-related outcomes?

6. What trends and gaps are evident over time between students with disabilities and students without disabilities in academic achievement and growth, and what measures does the District use to determine grade-level progress or mastery and communicate progress to families?
7. How do students, families, educators, providers, paraeducators, administrators, and other stakeholders experience the system? How do these stakeholders experience the system if/when there is a disagreement with a proposed program or placement?
8. What factors contribute to outplacement, and where may opportunities exist to strengthen in-district capacity while preserving individualized decision-making?
9. How effectively are staffing, professional learning, time, services, spending, and other resources aligned to student needs and outcomes?
10. What actionable, prioritized changes should the District consider in the short, medium, and longer term?

5. Scope of Services

The selected respondent shall perform a comprehensive, mixed-methods, system-level review. The final scope will be incorporated into the contract, but proposals shall address each component below.

5.1 Project Initiation, Governance, and Management

- Conduct a kickoff meeting with District leadership to confirm review questions, scope, data sources, project roles, communication protocols, confidentiality expectations, and deliverables.
- Provide a detailed project management plan identifying milestones, responsible parties, onsite and virtual work, meeting cadence, decision points, dependencies, risks, and mitigation strategies.
- Provide a comprehensive initial data/document request and an efficient process for supplementing requests as questions emerge.
- Identify a single project director and project manager with authority to manage scope, schedule, quality, and communication.
- Minimize burden on staff, students, and families while preserving the integrity, breadth, and independence of the review.

5.2 Document, IEP, Data, Benchmarking, and Resource Analysis

- Review relevant District policies, procedures, program descriptions, organizational structures, staffing models, caseloads/workloads, service schedules, professional learning materials, communications, and other documents needed to understand current practice.
- Review aggregate and disaggregated data related to enrollment, disability identification, referral and evaluation patterns, MTSS/RTI, LRE/placement, program participation, outplacement, attendance, academic achievement and growth, progress monitoring, graduation, transition, and other relevant indicators.
- Propose a representative IEP or record-review methodology that examines alignment among present levels, student needs, goals/objectives, services, accommodations/modifications, placement, progress monitoring, and educational benefit. The proposal shall describe sampling, reviewer training, inter-rater consistency, and system-level reporting.
- Analyze patterns by school level, program, disability category, placement type, and other relevant variables where data quality and privacy rules permit.
- Analyze staffing and resource allocation, special education spending patterns, outplacement costs, and cost-effectiveness at a system level in relation to student needs, services, placements, and outcomes.
- Benchmark selected data and practices against Connecticut data, District Reference Group data where appropriate, comparable districts, state trends, and evidence-based best practices. The

proposal shall explain how valid comparison groups will be selected and limitations communicated.

- Use appropriate data-quality checks, suppression rules, and caveats; distinguish correlation, association, and causal claims.

5.3 Family and Staff Surveys and Stakeholder Engagement

Family and staff surveys and stakeholder engagement are central components and a high priority of this review..

- Design, administer, analyze, disaggregate, and report a districtwide survey of all families of students with disabilities.
- Design, administer, analyze, disaggregate, and report a districtwide survey of staff who teach, support, supervise, or make decisions affecting students with disabilities.
- Include survey domain. such as communication and responsiveness; family experience with IEP/PPT processes; perceived service effectiveness and fidelity; access to supports; inclusion; mental-health and behavioral supports; transitions; access to academic and nonacademic opportunities; and overall satisfaction.
- Provide open-ended response opportunities and a defensible qualitative coding process, including quality-control procedures.
- Provide response-rate strategies for both surveys that may include advance communications, reminders, accessible formats, mobile compatibility, language access, and other appropriate participation supports.
- Describe proposed disaggregation for family and staff survey results by school level, staff role, and other relevant categories, subject to data quality and privacy-protective minimum group sizes.
- Report the number of invitations distributed, completed responses, response rates, applicable denominators, subgroup representation, and methodological limitations. Where feasible, assess potential nonresponse bias and do not characterize survey or engagement findings as districtwide unless participation and evidence support that conclusion.
- Conduct interviews, focus groups, or listening sessions with a balanced set of central office leaders, school administrators, special education and general education teachers, related service providers, paraeducators, mental-health/behavior staff, students where appropriate and approved, and families.
- Use consistent protocols and sampling approaches designed to capture varied perspectives across levels, programs, disability profiles, placements, and service intensity.
- Distinguish isolated experiences from corroborated patterns and triangulate stakeholder input with other evidence.
- Ensure that survey and engagement findings are reported in aggregate and de-identified form and are used to identify system themes, not adjudicate individual complaints.

5.4 Onsite School Visits and Classroom/Program Observations

Onsite visits and observations are central components and a high priority of this review. . Respondents shall identify the proposed number of onsite days, buildings, classrooms/programs, observers, and observation periods. The District expects broad coverage and requires all school levels and major program types to be represented.

- Observe a representative range of general education/inclusion settings, co-taught classrooms, resource supports, intensive and specialized programs, related service delivery where appropriate, clinical/therapeutic or behavioral supports where appropriate, transition/18-22 programming, and nonacademic or extracurricular contexts where feasible and relevant.

- Describe whether all buildings will be visited. Any proposed sampling of buildings must be justified and must still support valid cross-school and districtwide conclusions.
- Use a structured observation protocol aligned to the guiding questions, including LRE, access to grade-level instruction, specially designed instruction, service model implementation, student engagement, instructional supports, accommodations/modifications, independence, belonging, and inclusion.
- Describe observer qualifications, training, calibration, documentation, and quality assurance.
- Coordinate observations with the District to minimize disruption and avoid evaluating or publicly identifying individual students or staff.
- Aggregate observation findings and triangulate them with data, documents, surveys, and stakeholder input.

5.5 Continuum, LRE, Service Delivery, Access, and Outcomes

- Examine the full continuum, including early intervention, inclusive and co-taught settings, resource services, intensive/specialized supports, related services, behavioral/mental-health/social-emotional/therapeutic supports, outplacement, and transition/18-22 programming.
- Review how placement and service-model decisions are made, how services are matched to need, and whether students are supported in the least restrictive environment appropriate to their individual needs.
- Examine service-delivery consistency across schools and programs at the system level.
- Examine early identification, intervention, MTSS/RTI, referral, evaluation, and transition pathways for consistency and effectiveness.
- Analyze access to grade-level curriculum, academic courses, electives, and extracurricular activities.
- Examine transitions from preschool to elementary, elementary to middle, middle to high school, and high school to transition/18-22 or postsecondary pathways.
- Review staffing models, professional learning, training, supervision, role clarity, and support for special education teachers, related service providers, paraeducators, administrators, and other staff supporting students with disabilities.
- Connect student needs, services, placement, LRE, student/family experience, and academic, behavioral, social/emotional, and transition-related outcomes.

5.6 Findings, Recommendations, Reporting, and Initial Action Planning

- Provide one or more interim briefings to District leadership on emerging themes, data limitations, and questions requiring clarification.
- Provide a draft findings memorandum or draft report for factual review and contextual clarification. District review shall not compromise the independence of findings or recommendations.
- Prepare a final written report with an executive summary; review questions; methodology; data sources and limitations; findings and evidence; strengths/commendations; areas for improvement; and prioritized recommendations.
- For each major recommendation, identify the rationale, supporting evidence, suggested priority, implementation horizon, key dependencies, anticipated resource implications, and suggested measures of progress.
- Conduct at least one action-planning or leadership working session to support initial prioritization and next steps. Ongoing implementation support may be proposed as an optional service.
- Present findings and recommendations to the Westport Board of Education.

- Recommendations are advisory and will be considered by the District and Board of Education in light of individual student needs, professional judgment, strategic priorities, available resources, collective bargaining obligations, and other relevant considerations.
- The final report, executive summary, survey summaries, and Board presentation are expected to be public documents, subject to legally required redactions and applicable confidentiality protections. The selected respondent shall prepare these materials in an accessible, public-facing format.

6. Scope Boundaries and Prohibited Activities

The review shall focus on system-level program effectiveness. Unless expressly added by written agreement, the selected respondent shall not be expected or authorized to:

- Investigate or adjudicate individual student disputes, parent/guardian complaints, staff complaints, retaliation allegations, or personnel matters, although to the extent that any student disputes, parent/guardian complaints, staff complaints, retaliation allegations, or personnel matters may be identified or suspected during the course of the review, such matters may be considered in assessing the District's system-level program effectiveness and any recommendations for the District.
- Make legal findings or offer opinions regarding whether the District violated IDEA, Section 504, ADA, FERPA, or any other law in an individual matter or specific case.
- Serve as legal counsel, hearing officer, state complaint investigator, or compliance monitor.
- Conduct a full ADA/facilities accessibility audit, although the respondent may identify programmatic or physical-access barriers affecting participation by students with disabilities.
- Conduct a full fiscal, forensic accounting, or budget audit, although the respondent shall review resource allocation, spending patterns, staffing, outplacement costs, and cost-effectiveness at a system level.
- Publicly identify individual students, families, staff members, or confidential student records.
- Contact District employees, Board members, families, students, or community members outside District-approved engagement processes.
- Bidding and/or working on follow up or future projects or activities that come as a result of the recommendations and district action plans developed from this review. This prohibited activity can only be removed by the Superintendent of Schools (or his designee) if such action is deemed to be in the best interest of the school district.

7. Required Qualifications and Team Commitments

Shortlisted respondents have already demonstrated baseline qualifications. The final proposal shall confirm and provide project-specific detail regarding the following:

1. Districtwide PK-12/K-12 special education program-review experience in public school districts, including districts comparable to Westport.
2. A named review team that includes individuals with substantial leadership experience in special education, pupil personnel services, student services, special education administration, state education agency work, RESC work, or comparable roles; Connecticut public-school or Connecticut-system experience is preferred.
3. Familiarity with IDEA implementation, LRE, Child Find/referral/evaluation systems, IEP quality, CT-SEDS, EdSight, Connecticut data and accountability structures, and Connecticut district operating realities.
4. Demonstrated family-survey and stakeholder-engagement expertise, including accessibility, disaggregation, qualitative coding, confidentiality, and reporting.

5. Demonstrated ability to conduct structured onsite school-building visits and observations across the full continuum.
6. Strong quantitative and qualitative research methodology, including triangulation, pattern-finding, outcome analysis, benchmarking, disaggregation, and system-level reporting.
7. Capacity to complete the review within four to six months with the proposed team and staffing plan.
8. FERPA-aligned data protections, secure records handling, de-identification, suppression, survey confidentiality/anonymity, and appropriate record retention/destruction.
9. Ability to provide practical, prioritized, actionable recommendations and support initial implementation planning.

The proposal shall identify the specific individuals who will perform the work, their roles, anticipated hours or days, onsite responsibilities, and availability. The District will evaluate the proposed team, not merely the firm's broader staff. Any post-award substitution of key personnel is subject to prior written approval.

8. Required Timeline

The base scope must be completed within four to six months from notice to proceed through final report and Board presentation. Respondents shall submit a detailed, realistic work plan, preferably in Gantt-chart or milestone format, addressing at least:

- Kickoff and finalization of review questions and protocols;
- Data/document request and receipt;
- Family and staff surveys: design, District review, launch, reminders, close, analysis, and reporting;
- Stakeholder interviews, focus groups, and student engagement where approved;
- Onsite school visits and observations;
- IEP/record review and quantitative analysis;
- Triangulation, benchmarking, and emerging-findings review;
- Draft report for factual review;
- Final report and Board presentation.

The schedule shall state District dependencies, required turnaround times, staffing assumptions, and contingency plans for delays or lower-than-anticipated survey participation.

9. Required Deliverables

- Final project work plan, review questions, schedule, communication plan, data request, and confidentiality/data-management plan.
- Approved family and staff survey instruments, administration and response-rate plans, analysis plans, and final survey findings reports.
- Stakeholder engagement plan, sampling rationale, protocols, and aggregate synthesis.
- Site-visit and observation plan, structured protocol, sampling rationale, and aggregate synthesis.
- IEP/record-review methodology, rubric/protocol, quality assurance procedures, and aggregate findings.
- Interim leadership briefing(s) and preliminary findings presentation or memorandum.
- Draft final report for factual review.
- Final report in accessible PDF and editable format, including executive summary, methodology, data sources, findings, strengths, recommendations, limitations, and appendices.

- Board of Education presentation deck and presentation.
- All nonproprietary project data files, coding frameworks, and instruments created specifically for the District, subject to contract terms and privacy requirements.

10. District Responsibilities and Available Support

The District will:

- Designate a project liaison and provide timely access to leadership for project decisions.
- Provide access, through an agreed upon data-sharing process, to relevant student-level and aggregate data, IEP records, staffing information, financial/outplacement data, policies, procedures, and program materials within the approved scope.
- Coordinate building access and assist with scheduling District-approved interviews, focus groups, observations, and student/family engagement.
- Distribute District-approved survey and engagement communications through District channels.
- Review instruments, schedules, and draft materials within agreed-upon turnaround times.
- Provide contextual information and factual corrections while preserving the respondent's independent professional judgment.

11. Proposal Submission Requirements

Proposals should be concise, specific to Westport, and organized in the order below. The technical proposal should not exceed 35 pages, excluding resumes, sample work, required forms, and the separate fee proposal.

I. Cover Letter and Certification

- Identify the legal entity, primary contact, authorized signatory, and any proposed partners or subcontractors.
- Confirm that the proposal remains valid for at least 120 days.
- Identify any material changes from the RFQ submission.
- Confirm acceptance of the mandatory proposal commitments or clearly identify requested exceptions.

II. Understanding of Westport and Proposed Review Questions

- Summarize the respondent's understanding of the District's purpose, context, priorities, scope boundaries, and desired outcomes.
- State the proposed review questions and explain how they connect student needs, services, LRE, experiences, outcomes, and resources.

III. Detailed Methodology and Work Plan

- Describe all proposed methods, data sources, sampling strategies, analytic procedures, triangulation, quality assurance, benchmarking, and limitations.
- Address each component of Section 5 and identify any recommended refinements or alternatives.

IV. Family and Staff Surveys and Stakeholder Engagement Plan

- Provide the proposed survey development process, domains, platform, accessibility/language access, response-rate strategy, disaggregation, open-ended coding, privacy protections, and reporting.
- Provide the proposed stakeholder focus groups, sample sizes or selection approach, protocols, interview/focus-group format, and strategy for balanced participation.

- Explain how the respondent will report invitations, completed responses, response rates, denominators, subgroup representation, potential nonresponse bias where feasible, and limitations
- Explain how the respondent will distinguish isolated experiences from corroborated system-level patterns.

V. Site Visit and Observation Plan

- Identify proposed onsite days, buildings, levels, program types, observation settings, approximate number of observations, and personnel assigned.
- Provide or describe the structured observation framework, observer training/calibration, documentation, analysis, and system-level reporting.

VI. Data, IEP, Benchmarking, and Resource Analysis Plan

- Identify requested datasets and documents, analytic approach, disaggregation, IEP/record sampling and review, CT/DRG/comparable-district benchmarking, staffing/resource analysis, outplacement analysis, and cost-effectiveness approach.
- Describe the proposed analysis of achievement and growth gaps between students with disabilities and students without disabilities, including measures of grade-level progress or mastery and family reporting practices.
- Explain how the analysis will remain a program-effectiveness review rather than a fiscal or legal compliance audit.

VII. Proposed Team and Level of Effort

- Confirm the project director, project manager, subject-matter experts, survey/data staff, onsite observers, and subcontractors.
- Provide roles, relevant leadership experience, Connecticut experience, onsite responsibilities, availability, anticipated hours/days, and percentage of total project effort.
- Provide updated resumes only where the RFQ submission has changed or where additional detail is necessary.

VIII. Potential Conflicts of Interest

- Identify any past (within the past 5 years) or present contractual or other relationships with the District or member of the Administration;
- Identify any other factors you are aware of that could reasonably affect the independence of the review or give rise to a conflict of interest or appearance of a conflict of interest.

IX. Timeline and Project Management

- Provide a detailed four- to six-month calendar with milestones, dependencies, communication cadence, risk management, and quality-control checkpoints.

X. Deliverables

- Describe the content, format, timing, and lead personnel for each required deliverable.
- Identify any proprietary tools or restrictions and describe the District's use rights.

XI. Data Privacy and Security

- Describe data storage/transfer, encryption, access controls, role-based permissions, incident response, de-identification, suppression, survey confidentiality/anonymity, retention/destruction, subcontractor controls, and experience with data-sharing agreements.

XII. Exceptions and Assumptions

- List all exceptions, assumptions, exclusions, required District resources, or proposed changes to scope or terms. Silence will be interpreted as acceptance, subject to contract negotiation.

12. Separate Fee Proposal

- Pricing shall be submitted as a separate file and shall not appear in the technical proposal. The fee proposal shall include:
- A fixed, not-to-exceed total price for the complete base scope;
- A cost breakdown by phase, deliverable, and team member/role;
- Hourly or daily rates by role and estimated hours/days;
- Travel, lodging, meals, platform, survey, printing, and other expenses, identifying whether each is included or reimbursable;
- A proposed payment schedule tied to deliverables or milestones;
- Assumptions affecting price;
- Optional pricing for additional onsite days, additional survey populations, added analyses, implementation coaching, or other optional services;
- Any rate caps for additional services during the contract term.

The District is not obligated to select the lowest-cost proposal. Technical merit, feasibility, risk, cost reasonableness, and overall value will inform final selection. The District may request a best and final offer.

13. Questions, Addenda, and No-Contact Requirement

Questions regarding this RFP must be submitted in writing by e-mail to Elio Longo at elongo@westportps.org by August 21, 2026. Responses will be issued in writing to all invited respondents. No oral interpretation or clarification is binding. The District may issue addenda as it deems appropriate.

Except through the process expressly authorized by this RFP, respondents shall not contact District employees, officers, Board of Education members, students, families, or officials concerning this procurement. Failure to comply may result in disqualification. This restriction does not prohibit ordinary-course communications unrelated to the RFP.

14. Contracting, Confidentiality, and General Conditions

- The selected respondent will operate as an independent contractor and will be responsible for its personnel and approved subcontractors.
- The selected respondent must protect all student, family, staff, and District information and comply with applicable privacy and confidentiality obligations, including FERPA. District-approved confidentiality, nondisclosure, data-sharing, or security agreements may be required before data access.
- Reports and presentations shall preserve confidentiality and present findings in aggregate or de-identified form.
- The final report, executive summary, survey summaries, and Board presentation are expected to be public documents, subject to legally required redactions and applicable confidentiality protections.

- The selected respondent shall not subcontract work without prior written District approval. Approved subcontractors are subject to the same privacy, insurance, performance, and confidentiality obligations.

15. Insurance Requirements

Prior to commencing services, the selected respondent shall furnish Certificates of Insurance evidencing coverage acceptable to the District. At a minimum, the respondent shall maintain the following insurance throughout the term of the contract:

- Commercial General Liability: \$1,000,000 per occurrence and \$2,000,000 aggregate.
- Workers' Compensation: Statutory limits as required by Connecticut law, with Employer's Liability coverage.
- Professional Liability (Errors & Omissions): Not less than \$1,000,000 per claim.
- Automobile Liability: \$1,000,000 combined single limit for owned, hired, and non-owned vehicles, if applicable.
- Cyber/Privacy Liability: Not less than \$1,000,000 per claim, including coverage for privacy breaches, network security liability, and costs associated with unauthorized disclosure of confidential information.

The Westport Board of Education and the Town of Westport shall be named as Additional Insureds on the Commercial General Liability policy. All insurers shall be licensed to conduct business in Connecticut and have an A.M. Best rating of A- or better. Certificates of Insurance shall be provided prior to commencement of services.

- The selected respondent shall comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, policies, and nondiscrimination requirements.
- Proposal materials may be subject to applicable public-records requirements. Respondents should clearly identify information claimed to be confidential or proprietary, but the District cannot guarantee confidentiality beyond what the law permits.
- Final ownership and permitted use of deliverables, instruments, data files, and proprietary materials will be addressed in the contract.

16. District Rights

The District reserves the right to reject any or all proposals; waive informalities or irregularities; request clarification, additional information, presentations, demonstrations, or best and final offers; verify information and request and contact references; negotiate scope, staffing, methodology, schedule, fees, deliverables, and terms; discontinue the process; or select the proposal the District determines to be in its best interest. The issuance of this RFP does not obligate the District to award a contract or reimburse proposal costs.

17. Submission Deadline and Delivery

The deadline for submission of proposals is **Tuesday, September 1, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. EST.**

Respondents must submit **one (1) sealed paper copy** and **one (1) electronic copy** (on a USB flash drive) by the submission deadline. Both the paper copy and the electronic copy must include the **Technical Proposal** and the **Fee Proposal**.

The electronic copy must be provided in **searchable PDF format** and named using the following convention:

[VendorName]_Westport_Special_Education_27-003-RFP.pdf

Submit to:

Elio Longo
Chief Financial Officer
Westport Public Schools
Room 300
110 Myrtle Avenue
Westport, CT 06880

The sealed envelope or package must be clearly labeled "27-003-RFP" on the outside.

Westport Public Schools will not accept proposals received after the submission deadline. Late proposals will be rejected without exception, including proposals delayed in transit, regardless of the cause or method of delivery. It is the sole responsibility of the respondent to ensure that its proposal is received by Westport Public Schools at the designated location on or before the stated deadline.