

COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE RFP IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

Q & A

Q: Can we turn in 17 ½ pages instead of 15 pages for the Narrative? When you add the pages all up they add to 17 ½ not 15.

A: On page 11 of the RFP it states that the Narrative/Executive Summary must not exceed 15 pages total (not including attachments and required documents). However, it was correctly brought to our attention that when you add the pages/spaces they add to 17 ½ instead of 15, so **go ahead and turn in 17 ½ pages instead if needed.**

Q: On page 30 of Appendix B, it says that grantees must provide board letters of support from District, principal and key partners. This was a requirement for the Planning Grants and was submitted with that proposal. So, for the Implementation Grants, do we need to attach them again, and, if so, can we use the original ones, or are updated ones required?

A: It is important that the letters of support are reflective of the applications and strategic plan developed in the planning process. We are aware that the timing of school board endorsement could be problematic if not planned in advance. However, the Superintendent and principals can address commitment to full participation of the plan and on-going coordination as well as the participating planning partners. If the school board can not endorse at the time of the application submittal, it is expected that a letter of endorsement be received prior to funding approval.

Q: On Page 40, Appendix E checklist, it says to include a signed Phase II Executive Summary. Does the signature on the coversheet meet this; or are we expected to sign the 15 page document?

A: Signature on coversheet does meet the need for a signed document.

Q: On attachment 7, I am trying to complete it for Isla Vista and Santa Maria-Bonita as a sub-contractor for WEB. When I fill it out, there is a defective cell. It will not allow me to enter the Lead agency. I looked at the Lead and it does the same thing.

This didn't happen when I did my WEB attachments, so I know something is wrong.

A: You need to complete Attachment #2 (if not done so already) as this populates throughout all the Lead attachment sheets. My understanding from your email below is that your filling out attachments as a sub to both the IVYP and SMBSD collaborative RFA's. Therefore unless you go to attachment #2 and fill in the Lead Agency Name (either IVYP or SMBSD) then it will show up on all attachments where we ask for the Lead Name. This file is locked to lessen the confusion with all the attachments in this packet. For the subcontractors name you will need to input each one by hand in each attachment.

LEAD ATTACHEMENT #2

Updated On: April 6, 2011

Attachment 2 Scope of Work	
Lead Agency Name:	Isla Vista
Program Name:	

SUB ATTACHMENT #7

Attachment 7 Agency Involvement in Litigation Form and/or Compliance Difficulties	
Lead Agency Name:	Isla Vista
Subcontractor Name:	

The Lead Agency Name: located here populates throughout all of the attachments

SUB ATTACHMENT #7 Lead Agency Name will appear already so you won't need to add anything because it has been pre-populated from Lead

Q: Could you please clarify on Attachment 8?

A: Attachment 8 has two parts: lead and subcontractor, you need to complete both.

Q: Column A = First 5

A: Yes

Q: Columns B-D = each of the lead and subcontractors' TOTAL AGENCY BUDGET -OR- just the funding each of us brings to THIS COLLABORATIVE PROJECT from various sources.

A: Both the lead A8 and in the Sub A8: you note in B the funds you are allocating to First 5 as part of the budget, in C you note any other secured funding that you bring and that you are using as part to this budget, funds here are part of the 5% evaluation, as well those in column A and B, in D you note funds that you bring and that you are using as part of your budget, those are not linked to the 5% evaluation cost. Please refer to previous email from today with the explanation about the **5% Evaluation in the Budget:**

“5% of the requested amount to First 5 and the Funder Collaborative will be allocated to First 5 evaluation. Match dollars (such as MAA and other like funding) not requiring additional evaluation do not need an allocation of 5%. However, when funding is requested to new funders which require evaluation, evaluation costs should be included in that funding request to cover additional evaluation requirements. If the clarification above becomes problematic while completing the First 5 Attachment 8, evaluation costs will be recalculated at the time of funding and contract approval. A Memorandum of Understanding will be developed to clarify the evaluation agreement.”

Q: GROUPS in attachment 3 continued. I've only tracked by individual before so don't know what to put as a number. Number of clients in the group? Or is the number of groups expected for each age category? As I understand it, we WILL NOT be counting individuals, right??

A: These is to note **duplicated** services. For example, one client that will receive multiple services or a service that will be provided to a group as a group delivery.

Q: What service code should the collaboratives use for the kinder health screenings?

A: Probably *Coordinated Service Delivery* and then specify in the additional detail section that this service represents the Kinder health screenings and detail what those screenings consist of.

Q: Since we are working with a finite number of clients, but they may be receiving multiple services, how do we count the clients? This can happen in two different ways – within agency or across agency. For example, Guadalupe Collaborative is going to request funding for three SBCEO agencies to provide services – WEB, CATCH and Health Linkages, but some of the same kids/families may be receiving services from all 3 programs. OR, a client may be receiving services from WEB and also receiving services from the Guadalupe FRC. So, does the client get counted each time they get a service? This seem like it would inflate the numbers because the same child would be counted several times.

A: You count **each service** that is provided. You will develop attachment 4 for each of your subcontractors (for example, in your case Florene one for WEB, one CATCH, and one for Health Linkages) to indicate the **units of service** projected for each of the subcontractors as each of these agencies provide a different service and the units may not be the same as some of the services will be universal and other services will be targeted (different intervention tiers). In attachment 3 is where you differentiate individual versus group services. The numbers won't be inflated because client can receive more than one service but the client will be counted only once (once it gets entered only in GEMS) and when the service(s) are provided to the client, those service(s) will be added to client profile (then you add service transaction in GEMS).

Q; For the projected units of services drop down menus, they have been designed for services receiving from the collaborative, instead of a specific model; so they are more generic. So, if WEB and SMOOTH are providing services, in our WEB drop-downs there are home visits and transportation as options. But in these attachments do not include those options in the drop-down menus. So, do we just pick what we think best defines the services from the options?

A: Pick what best defines the service from the drop down menu (those options match the codes in GEMS, therefore, they can't be changed. Add specifications of the service in the "**additional detail section**" to show exactly what the service entails.

Q: On the budget, Lori and I were starting to enter some of the budget items as either First 5 funded, MATCH from other funding, or requested from the other Foundation funders. However, I noticed that the MATCH column is included in the total budget, which then gets

the 5% of the total cost allocated to evaluation. This doesn't seem right to me. I understand that it should be applied to the funding from the foundations because it means more services, which means more data analysis. However, with the match, this may not be the case. For example, we may be using the match for salary for admin, data input, etc. Also, I applied for a \$50,000 AVANCE grant, which is to be used for start-up costs, but it would not mean any more services or any more data for UCSB to analyze, but if I put it in as a match, I automatically lose \$2500 of the grant. Is this right???

A: 5% Evaluation in the Budget: 5% of the requested amount to First 5 and the Funder Collaborative will be allocated to First 5 evaluation. Match dollars (such as MAA and other like funding) not requiring additional evaluation do not need an allocation of 5%. However, when funding is requested to new funders which require evaluation, evaluation costs should be included in that funding request to cover additional evaluation requirements. If the clarification above becomes problematic while completing the First 5 Attachment 8, evaluation costs will be recalculated at the time of funding and contract approval. A Memorandum of Understanding will be developed to clarify the evaluation agreement.

Q: Subcontractor's signature section in A1, can they be moved to a separate page?

A: Based on the feedback we have received regarding the logistics to collect the signatures of the subcontractors in Attachment 1 in the CC RFP we wanted to let you know we understand the issue and that we want to accommodate your feedback to facilitate process. Right now Attachment 1 includes in one page the signatures for the leads, the subcontractors, and the budget so we have decided to look for a way for you to be able to collect the signatures for the subcontractors in a separate page. We'll connect with you shortly.

Q: Logic Models

A: The 4 models are aligned with the 4 focus areas in the Children Thriving Report Card (mandated results in the RFP and Thrive Goals box in the logic models):

- 1.Children Enter School Ready to Learn
- 2.Children are proficient in grade-level standards through grade 3
- 3.Children are healthy and thriving
4. Families Support their Children's Learning and Development

Regarding the interim results area, we wanted to remind you that those may not be what you are envisioning for your collaborative but for right now those are simply place holders and when implementation may take place, we'll be able to work together to modify those and make them fit your own.