

Questions submitted for RFP# 17-011

Program Questions

- 1. Is NYSED continuing the use of student growth measures? If so, will these data be available for the secondary data analysis?**

It is SED's expectation that by year two of the state-level evaluation, a state-level data collection system will be available for sub-grantees. Data collected would include student growth measures. Currently sub-grantees are required to report aggregated data on student growth measures such as state assessments and grades to the federal government. With a state-level data collection system SED would have access to student-level data on program participants and could make the data available to the state-level evaluator for analysis.

- 2. What is the current 21st CCLC participation by grade by program?**

While SED does collect some data elements such as the number of participants by program and the hours of participation by student/by program, SED does not currently have a state-level data collection system that would make it possible to provide the answer to this particular question regarding participation by grade by program. It is SED's expectation that by year two of the state-level evaluation, a state-level data collection system will be available for sub-grantees. With a state-level data collection system SED would have access to both student-level and program-level data so that such analysis could be generated.

- 3. When do you anticipate the subgrantee data elements will be made available each year?**

Given the challenges of getting data from various school district across the state, including the large and complicated New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE), we typically do not have all of the required APR data elements available until late October or November each year. Because the availability of data tends to vary from year to year, this sentence from the RFP provides for some flexibility with regard to reporting dates: *The secondary analysis report will be submitted to the NYSED by November 15, based on the previous program year data, if all data is available by October 1 of that year. Extensions will be granted if necessary, allowing the bidder 45 days after all required data is made available, for the report submission.*

- 4. Is the contractor required to notify the department for all levels of staff departure or just for the PI and co-PI?**

It is not necessary to notify the department of staff departure for all levels of staff, only key staff and subcontractor staff performing evaluation work.

- 5. How does the NYSED define professional staff for the purposes of providing resumes?**

Professional staff would be defined as any staff performing essential evaluation work on this project, including any subcontractor staff performing evaluation work.

6. Given the diverse structure of each grantee program, fidelity of implementation will look different for each grantee. Does the department have specific metrics to measure fidelity of implementation?

No, the department does not have specific metrics to measure fidelity of implementation but will rely on the bidder to develop appropriate measures.

7. Would NYSED consider additional qualitative research with students that took place during site observations?

Yes, any work performed during a site visit, including additional qualitative research for the purpose of the overall evaluation of the program, would be acceptable.

8. Is there any data collected by the Resource Centers (RCs) that will be made available to evaluators? If so, can you describe the type of data that will be made available?

Yes the RCs are expected to comply with any and all requests for data by compiling requested data, responding to the evaluator's inquiries about the Center's work, and submitting Quarterly and Annual reports to both the NYSED and the State-level evaluator. Requested data might include, for example, satisfaction surveys following professional development events conducted by the RCs.

9. Can NYSED provide any additional details about the data and/or data sources that will be provided for the annual secondary analysis (described on the bottom of page 6 of the RFP)?

All sub-grantees are required to collect and report data to the federal government via 21APR which is managed by The Tactile Group. Sub-grantees collect student level data from their respective school districts and then report aggregated data elements that align with the Federal Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) indicators/measures, such as percentage of regular program participants whose math/English grades improved from fall to spring and the percentage of regular participants who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State Assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. They also report other program level data such as hours of operation, activities offered, staffing levels, etc. It is SED's expectation that by year two of the state-level evaluation, a state-level data collection system will be available for sub-grantees that will standardize how grantees collect the data and provide a means for SED to have access to this data. Sub-grantees would still need to aggregate their own data for 21APR reporting, but the student-level and program level data from all sub-grantees would then be available to SED and the state-level evaluator for secondary analysis purposes. In year one of the state-level evaluation the bidder would have access to data collected by SED in separate reporting formats such as, program data collected as part of the mid-year report collected via Survey Monkey, program objective reporting, also via Survey Monkey, and hours of attendance by student via SED-provided reporting form to assess whether programs meet their target participation numbers each year as required for full funding.

10. Is NYSED happy with the current evaluation firm?

The current evaluation firm has fulfilled the requirements of the contract to date.

11. Will the incumbent be allowed to bid on this procurement?

Yes, eligible bidders include any Local Education Agencies (LEAs), Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), public or private Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), not-for-profit and for-profit organizations or agencies.

12. Will local grantees be able to provide state student ID numbers for all attending students?

It is anticipated that state student ID numbers for all attending students will be provided by grantees through the state-level data collection system available in years two through five.

13. Can NYSED provide additional details about variables that have been collected in previous years that may serve as a baseline comparison?

At this time, the only variables we have are number of participants by program and hours of participation by student name/ID # by program, program data such as activities, staffing, hours of operation, etc. and objectives reporting by program for the 2015-2016 program year. As of June 30, 2017, those current 21st CCLC grants will sunset and a new cohort of sub-grants will be awarded with an anticipated start date of July 1, 2017. Archived data is available for programs in New York State prior to 2014, which is when the USDOE switched vendors for APR data collection to The Tactile Group. After that date APR data was no longer available to State Education Agencies (SEAs).

14. Approximately what percentage of current grantees (round 6 grantees) received funding in previous cycles?

Approximately half of current grantees had received funding in the previous funding cycle. A comparison with all previous cycles has not been done.

15. Does NYSED estimate that more than 50 grantees will be awarded as part of Round 7?

While we cannot say for certain at this time how many grantees will be awarded, NYSED anticipates a similar number, or slightly higher, to the number awarded for Round 6, which was 129.

16. What is the estimated number of program-level reports that will require review?

The number of current grantees is 129 and a similar number is expected in this round of funding. The program-level evaluation assessment is envisioned as a high-level overview that looks at some standard of comprehensiveness and level of quality and usefulness.

17. Do all 129 programs utilize different evaluators?

While there are a number of different local program evaluators not every program has a different evaluator. There are some evaluators who evaluate more than one 21st CCLC grant program

18. Are local programs required to hire independent third party evaluators, or are there opportunities to use internal team members?

Grantees are required to use an external local program evaluator, and may not use internal team members.

19. It appears that the vendor is being asked to provide guidance on the development of the statewide online database, not to develop the database. Is that correct?

That is correct.

20. Does SED envision a state online database (years 2 thru 5) that is linked to that provided by the Tactile Group—so that sub-grantees need to make only one submission?

While that would be ideal, the 21apr system operated by the Tactile Group does not have that capability at the current time. They have not indicated that it will be an option in the future.

If so, would SED facilitate conversations between the vendor and Tactile?

If the option became available in the future SED would be willing to facilitate conversations between the vendor and Tactile Group.

21. RFP states that the number of grantees is expected to change as of July '17 because they are releasing a new application. Can they project whether the number funded is likely to go up or down, and by how much?

SED cannot predict at this time if the number will increase or decrease. It is likely that the number will be close to the current number of 129 grantees.

22. Regarding Deliverable 4 (Review and assess quality and completeness of local program evaluation annual reports): Does this involve all programs or only the 50 selected for Deliverable 3?

The bidder will be expected to develop a rubric for assessing the program level reports for all grantees, not just the ten reports from grantees receiving a site visit or the 50 visited over the five years. The number of current grantees is 129 and a similar number is expected in this round of funding. The program-level evaluation assessment is a high-level overview that looks at some standard of comprehensiveness as per the evaluation manual and level of quality and usefulness.

23. Regarding Deliverables 7 and 8 (summer institutes and quarterly planning meetings): is there any preparation or presentation required of the state evaluator for these meetings?

There is no particular planning that would be required for the Summer Institute. Planning for the quarterly meetings would involve bringing forward any issues for discussion with either the Resource Centers or the SED that are pertinent to the state-level evaluation. SED will provide an agenda in advance of the meeting outlining the talking points for discussion and may request

that some particular pieces of information be at hand. No formal presentation would be required.

24. Regarding Deliverable 3 (Evaluation of Round 7 sub-grantees): Can some of the site visits be conducted virtually (e.g. through telephone or video conferencing)?

No. As per the RFP, “this evaluation must include one site visit to each of the 50 programs during the five-year contract period. Each site visit will be up to one full day in duration.”

25. Among the 129 sites currently operating, how many are serving multiple grade ranges, (e.g. early childhood, elementary, middle, high school) or operating more than one distinct program?

A quantitative breakdown of this information has not been done. Please note that while there are 129 sub-grantees, there are 346 sites serving over 60,603 students. It is safe to say that a number of sub-grantees deliver programming that serve multiple grade ranges and/or operate more than one distinct program. Other sub-grantees offer similar programs across multiple site locations.

26. Can the bidder be included as the evaluator in Round 7 local grantee applications, with the understanding that if awarded both the state and a local project, the bidder would need to assist the local grantee in finding a new evaluator?

If the bidder was included as the evaluator for a funded Round 7 program and was awarded the state-level evaluation contract, the bidder would need to choose which evaluation they would conduct. If the state-level evaluation contract is accepted, the bidder would need to notify the local grantee that they are no longer available to provide local evaluation services. There would be no requirement that the bidder assist the local grantee in finding a new evaluator.

27. Can you confirm that the first secondary analysis report will be due on November 15, 2017? If this is correct, and the grant period for Round 7 local grantees begins July 1, 2017, can you confirm that the data will include information from just 3 months of programming (July 1- October 1)?

The first secondary analysis report will be due on November 15, 2017 and would be based on data from the 2016-2017 program year which started July 1, 2016 and ends June 30, 2017. Therefore it would include a full program year of data. It would be data from current Round 6 grantees, not the yet to be awarded Round 7 grantees. In year one, and/or prior to an operational state-level data collection system for APR reporting the bidder would have access to data collected by SED in separate reporting formats such as, program data collected as part of the mid-year report collected via Survey Monkey, program objective reporting, also via Survey Monkey, and hours of attendance by student via SED-provided reporting form to assess whether programs meet their target participation numbers each year as required for full funding.

28. On page 8,#4, it states that the program-level evaluation assessment reports are to be submitted to the NYSED program office 90 days after local program-level evaluation reports are due to NYSED (typically September 30), or by December 31st annually, for four years

beginning in 2018 and continuing through 2021. By our calculations, this would mean the first program-level assessment report would be due December 31, 2018. On page 10 it states that the first program-level evaluation assessment report will be due November 31, 2019. Can you clarify the month and year the first report will be due?

To clarify, the information on page 8 indicating that the program-level evaluation assessment reports are to be submitted to the NYSED program office 90 days after local program-level evaluation reports are due to NYSED (typically September 30), or by December 31st annually, for four years beginning in 2018 and continuing through 2021, is correct. The information on page 10 stating that the first program-level evaluation assessment report will be due November 31, 2019, is incorrect. Thank you for submitting this question for clarification.

29. The evaluation manual (page 6) states that the “State evaluators will work with the state to indicate what needs to be reported on the ‘Annual Evaluation Report’. In doing so, a template will be appended to the manual by the beginning of January, 2014. Can you provide this template so we can understand the typical scope of the local evaluation reports?

Some local evaluators objected to the idea of being required to use a particular evaluation template that they were not aware of prior to their contract agreements with their grantees. Others welcomed having a preferred format to follow. As a compromise SED asked the State-level evaluator to create an optional evaluation template for local program evaluators. The local implementation evaluation template and guidance can be found at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/documents/21stCCLCLocalEvaluationReportTemplateandGuidance.pdf>

30. For the program-level evaluation assessment mentioned on page 8, #4, will the evaluation reports of all 50 grantees need to be reviewed and assessed each year? Or, like the site visits, will 10 reports be reviewed in each of the contract years?

The bidder will be expected to develop a rubric for assessing the program level reports for all grantees, not just the ten reports from grantees receiving a site visit or the 50 visited over the five years. The number of current grantees is 129 and a similar number is expected in this round of funding. The program-level evaluation assessment is a high-level overview that looks at some standard of comprehensiveness as per the evaluation manual and level of quality and usefulness.

31. The evaluation manual (page 6) currently states that “SSOS survey data from a stratified sample of programs annually will be used to inform the statewide evaluation. Local program managers and evaluators will also be provided with program level data analysis by the Statewide Evaluator for local evaluation use.” The RFP does not include this survey analysis as an expected deliverable. Can you please clarify if this is an expectation and if so, the scope of work?

The SSOS survey was piloted in the last round of funding and found to be less informative than hoped for. This is one of the areas in the evaluation manual that is in need of editing and updating and that is why it was not mentioned in this RFP. Thank you for providing the opportunity to clarify this.

32. What is the approximate scope of the edits and updates being requested for the current evaluation manual?

SED does not anticipate major edits to the current evaluation manual. SED has already made some decisions with regard to changes that are needed and would consult with the bidder for consideration of any additional changes.

33. Could the state make available the most recent quarterly report, annual evaluation report, and secondary analysis report from the current contractor?

The most recent annual evaluation report is available at the following page link: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/21stCCLC/>. Quarterly reports are not currently posted. Since the federal government switched over to the Tactile Group for the federally required APR, states no longer have access to that data. The RFP provides a link to the type of secondary analysis report that would be expected in years two through five of the state-level evaluation. That link is provided here <https://www.cde.state.co.us/21stcclc/2013201421stcclcexternalreport>

MWBE Questions

1. Does a subcontractor have to be both minority and woman owned to meet the M/WBE participation goal?

NYS certified firms are found at <https://ny.newnycontracts.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchPublic.asp?TN=ny&XID=4687>. M/WBE participation goals are met utilizing firms or consultants certified by Empire State Development as either MBE, WBE or both.

2. If the prime bidder is a certified women-owned business, does this satisfy the 30% MWBE goal? If yes, should the prime complete the MWBE purchases form and the MWBE documents (i.e., M/WBE 100, M/WBE 102, and EEO 100) with itself listed as the MWBE?

Yes, this is allowable if the firm is certified by Empire State Development. All bidders must submit appropriate documents listed on M/WBE DOCUMENTS PACKAGE Checklist. A NYS certified M/WBE prime would indicate such status on the Utilization Plan.

3. In the past, a Goal Calculation Worksheet was included. Will we be allowed to use the Goal Calculation Worksheet with this project?

No, the Goal Calculation Worksheet is used only for grants and is not used for procurements.

Fiscal Questions

1. Can someone who is contracted as an evaluator for a local 21st CCLC sub-grantee also sub-contract with the State-wide applicant?

No. A local evaluator for a 21st CCLC sub-grantee may not subcontract on the State-level evaluation.

2. Can a WBE be written into both local proposals as a local independent evaluator AND a subcontractor for a statewide evaluation proposal?

No. A local evaluator for a 21st CCLC sub-grantee may not subcontract on the State-level evaluation.

3. If a WBE cannot be both a local evaluator and a subcontractor for the statewide evaluation, can the WBE still be written into both proposals?

An entity may not serve as a subcontractor for evaluation services for a local sub-grantee and the statewide evaluator. A subcontractor performing non-evaluation activities could be included in both contracts so long as there is no real or apparent conflict of interest.

4. And if the primary vendor is awarded the contract for the statewide evaluation in which the WBE subcontractor is included, can another WBE serve as the local evaluator for the local programs?

If the primary vendor is awarded the contract for the statewide evaluation and has included a subcontractor that was also included as the local evaluator for a sub-grantee, that subcontractor could not serve in both contracts.

5. In the Submission Documents, the link to the Consultant Disclosure Reporting form (form 19) (<http://www.osc.state.ny.us/agencies/gbull/g226forma.doc>) does not work (“Site Not Found”). Can SED provide an updated link?

The Consultant Disclosure Reporting form can be obtained at:
<http://www.osc.state.ny.us/agencies/forms/ac3271s.doc>.

6. What was the dollar amount of the previous contract?

The previous contract had a five year budget total of \$1,044,000. There have been some changes to the deliverables for this procurement. Please keep in mind that this is a “best value competitive procurement” with 30 percent of the total available points awarded based on cost, with lowest cost proposals receiving the highest score.