COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Questions & Answers

to

RFP No. 901757

### for

**Neighborhoods Ready for School Initiative**

**Networking/Bidders Conferences Held on February 19, 2019**

|  |
| --- |
| **This County of Alameda, General Services Agency (GSA), RFQ Questions & Answers (Q&A) has been electronically issued to potential bidders via e-mail. E-mail addresses used are those in the County’s Small Local Emerging Business (SLEB) Vendor Database or from other sources. If you have registered or are certified as a SLEB, please ensure that the complete and accurate e-mail address is noted and kept updated in the SLEB Vendor Database. This RFQ Q&A will also be posted on the GSA Contracting Opportunities website located at** [**http://acgov.org/gsa\_app/gsa/purchasing/bid\_content/contractopportunities.jsp**](http://acgov.org/gsa_app/gsa/purchasing/bid_content/contractopportunities.jsp) |
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**Responses to Questions**

1. Page 5 of the RFP, Section B (SCOPE AND BACKGROUND), states:

***The funder (First 5 Alameda County) is requiring the use of Results Based Accountability framework to support evaluation and data collection activities and will be looking at how the project impacts children’s kindergarten readiness within the target neighborhoods, families’ feelings of connection to neighborhood supportive infrastructure, and knowledge of child development milestones and resources. Data collection activities to support the funder’s evaluation aims are being implemented by the project team. The contractor will not be asked to manage this process, but should be comfortable enough with the RBA framework and evaluation practices to ensure project activities are complimentary.***

Can the County provide more information on the Results Based Accounting that is being required in this RFP?

* 1. **There is more information available online in regards to Results Based Accountability (RBA). Results Based Accountability is a well-known process in the government sector nationally that is designed to measure change resulting from public sector investments and action. For example, RBA asks questions such as did anything change as a result of the activity of this contract? What was the amount of activity – how many children and families were served by this family resource center? How well were they served? Is anyone better off? ALL IN Alameda County (ALL IN) will be collecting the metrics for Results Based Accounting (RBA) required by First 5 Alameda County (First 5). The contractor will not be responsible for defining an RBA framework, or collecting data within an RBA framework. ALL IN would like for the contractor to be familiar with the RBA process overall, and be able to discuss RBA with the parents involved in the participatory research project, and with First 5 Alameda County. ALL IN would like to encourage a dialogue among the various stakeholders in the NRFS initiative about the different types of evaluation research being conducted during the research process.**

1. Could there be some disarticulation between the community and the RBA being asked for by First 5? If the community is going one direction that does not align with the RBA, how does the County suggest that be resolved in this contract?
   1. **If differences emerge between the RBA process and the participatory research process, or if the findings are substantially different, there is an opportunity for a conversation between institutional partners and community partners. A great deal of data will be collected about individual children by institutional partners, such as First 5 and Oakland Unified School District. Oakland Unified School District has a very robust data and information system that is looking at kindergarten readiness and school indicators district wide. First 5 is also creating a data system called High Five that might eventually enable us to see what kind of services each individual child has received by the time they get to kindergarten. But these systems do not shine the light on the social conditions that a child and their family may be experiencing in their neighborhoods that may involve certain structural barriers to optimal development, such as structural racism, or economic factors such as gentrification, displacement, or disinvestment in the community. In the San Antonio neighborhood after 5 years of advocacy, there recently has been a renovation of the slide at San Antonio Park. This means that until the slide was renovated, the children at that park were not able to develop their gross motor skills using that slide. That is a re-framing what it is like for a neighborhood to be ready for school versus a child ready for school. ALL IN is quite excited about the opportunity to have a lot of data and metrics available about children, and families and schools, as well as the alternative data from a neighborhood context about what the parents are doing to get their children ready for kindergarten in the context of the neighborhood they live in.**
2. Page 5 of the RFP, Section B (SCOPE AND BACKGROUND) states:

***The aim of the project is to enrich and complement existing evaluation and data collection activities and bolster the overall parent and community leadership development efforts by engaging parents and community members in a community-led participatory research process that will identify community strengths and supportive factors, opportunities for problem solving, and ultimately inform and support the strategic direction of the SAFRC project, the NRFS initiative, and policies impacting and supporting neighborhood transformation more broadly.***

In regards to the leadership development component of the RFP, should that be proposed as a formal part of the work or should that remain more informal?

* 1. **That is at the discretion of the bidder. Many approaches to developing Promotors, or community healthcare workers, include training in community action research that is very well received. It depends on what is the right fit for the neighborhood and the parents.**

1. Page 6 of the RFP, Section C (BIDDER QUALIFICATIONS), Item 1 states:

***Bidder and/or all key personnel assigned to the project shall be regularly and continuously engaged in designing and facilitating community-based participatory research or participatory action research projects for at least five (5) years.***

Can the County provide an explanation if the 5 year requirement is for each staff member or for the entire firm that is bidding?

* 1. **This would mean that the bidder – the firm - has extensive experience with community based participatory evaluation research. The bidder must have a breadth of experience in conducting community-based research with neighborhood residents, communicating to systems relevant information from community perspective that can drive systems change, community organizing, research, etc.**

1. Page 6 of the RFP, Section B (SCOPE AND BACKGROUND) states:

***Parent and community participants will be compensated for their participation in this project. Implementing partners will distribute stipends to participants, however the contractor will be expected to assist in outreach, recruitment, and engagement. The contract will also be expected to assist in community capacity building related to research and evaluation, including training sessions on topics relevant to school readiness, child development, family strengthening, support and resources in the community, and advocacy. Participants will also receive training in research methods, including communication and outreach, research methods and design, community engagement, and other topics as identified.***

In terms of stipends, is there a specification around the rate of pay for the stipend – is it minimum wage or prevailing wage?

* 1. **ALL IN will pay all stipends for this contract. The evaluation/research contractor will not have to pay the stipends. ALL IN prefers that contractor would try and use a local vendor to purchase food and pay for childcare for the community training events.**

1. Page 7 of the RFP, Section D (SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS), Items 8.e. and 8.f. states:

***In the first year, work with community participants to develop a definition of “neighborhood ready for school” and present findings to project partners and others at a community event.***

***In the second year, work with community participants to design and implement research that results in recommendations for necessary (infrastructure, policy, administrative) changes to increase neighbor “school readiness” as defined by community***

Is it correct to assume that since this is a two-year contract, the first year expectation is supporting group of parents for action research of what a school ready neighborhood is and the second year is once the neighborhood definition is created, what resources would need to be in place for this to be true?

* 1. **Yes, this is correct. Working with community residents takes time to develop trust amongst each other and with the contractor. The County did not want to overestimate what could happen in the first year of this contract. As part of the research process, it is critical to define terms for everyone involved. For example, according to the evaluation metrics utilized by First 5, kindergarten readiness is measured by the kindergarten teacher, and involves an assessment of an individual child’s skills and abilities. The County would like to use this project to provide a complementary definition of kindergarten readiness focusing on neighborhood assets. What does a Neighborhood Ready for School look like? Are the playgrounds functional? Is the community safe? Is the library easily accessible? Do the parents have access to food for children?**

1. Page 22 of the RFP, Section R (SUBMITTAL OF BIDS), Item 2 states:

***Bidders must also submit an attached electronic copy of their proposal. The electronic copy must be in a single file (PDF with OCR preferred), and shall be an exact scanned image of the original hard copy Exhibit A – Bid Response Packet, including additional required documentation.***

Do bidders have to submit their proposal via e-mail electronically in addition to submitting their bid through the EZ Sourcing Portal?

* 1. **All bid responses must be submitted through the EZ Sourcing Portal. The County prefers for it to be one single PDF file. However, if the bid response is larger than 20 MB, then bidders are permitted to split the PDF into multiple files. Responses submitted via e-mail will be disqualified.**

1. Does the County have a page limit for this bid proposal?

**Description of Proposed Services, Budget Detail, and Implementation Plan & Schedule sections of the bid response should be no more than 10 pages, single-spaced.**

1. Are bidders able to subcontract on this RFP?
   1. **Bidders are permitted to subcontract for this RFP. Prime bidders that are not a Small Local Emerging Business (SLEB) or are not exempt from the SLEB requirement must subcontract 20% of the contract to a certified SLEB vendor. Bidders that are a 501c3 non-profit organization are exempt from the SLEB requirement.**

**A Community Based Organization (CBO) or a nonprofit organization is exempt if they provide services on behalf of the County directly to County clients/residents and certified by the IRS as 501c3.** **CBOs that do not have the 501c3 tax status are not exempt from the SLEB requirement.**

1. In regards to the evaluation for the larger initiative – the evaluation currently happening as part of the family resource center for their activities and the larger initiative, to what degree is that congruent with the evaluation of the Neighborhoods Ready for Schools initiative?
   1. **Creation of a family resource center at every site – four sites in total, 3 in Oakland and 1 outside of Oakland - is designed to be linked to multiple services, a high degree of community engagement in design, and intended to reach beyond typical early childhood services and support, such as pre-school or playgroups, and build an infrastructure of comprehensive family supports. Because the focus is on high-poverty neighborhoods, the family resource centers that are part of the NRFS initiative should also provide services to parents such as financial literacy and job development. First 5 likely will hire a contractor to evaluate the entire initiative looking at 4 sites, but it will be the responsibility of ALL IN to relate directly with a contractor that First 5 would engage. ALL IN has not yet received any request from any evaluators at First 5. There have been many meetings around the RBA model. First 5 is developing an online data entry system called High Five in which ALL IN will be inputting metrics such as how many parents participated in play groups and quantification of outputs. There will be some other larger evaluation activities happening over the next two years. It has not yet been determined what they are. ALL IN along with the other 3 sites have a mandatory carve-out of our annual budget for evaluation activities, separate and apart from anything First 5 is doing. ALL IN has chosen to use evaluation money to do a participatory action research project. This is the only site that is doing this type of evaluation. Each of the four sites is at a different stage of development in projects. ALL IN has chosen to focus on this participatory action research project.**
2. As the community is articulating what is needed in place for their children to be ready for school, how does that get communicated up through the evaluators – is it through this report only, or is it with direct engagement with the community?
   1. **The County does not have a blueprint for this communication. First 5 does a lot of convening of the NRFS partners, trying to get all of the grantees, such as ALL IN, together for professional development sessions that are topical in nature, like describing the fatherhood initiative or creating great early childhood spaces. The County can certainly see the opportunity in a year’s time for the contractor to propose a session to First 5 to get relevant stakeholders to listen to a presentation about their findings, ideally led by and/or co-created by the parents themselves. The County would hope that the contractor would seek opportunities among the parents themselves to tell the story of their research process and findings, in both community settings, and also institutional professional contexts.**
3. Are organizations that are currently working in Garfield Elementary eligible to partner on this grant or are the partners already not eligible to have their scope of work expanded?
   1. **ALL IN is the primary contractor with First 5. ALL IN subcontracts work to Lotus Bloom and EBAYC (East Bay Asian Youth Center), both of which are active nonprofits working on the Garfield School campus. Another partner which is not receiving funds from the County is Trybe, a small non-profit based in the San Antonio neighborhood. Those three non-profits are part of the leadership team and ALL IN has co-created this RFP with those organizations, so they are disqualified from bidding on this project. There are many non-profits that are working with Garfield school in different capacities that are not involved in the development of the RFP, and they would certainly be eligible to bid on this project.**

The following participants attended the Networking/Bidders Conference and Vendor Outreach:

|  | **Company Name / Address** | **Representative** | **Contact Information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | **Community Centered Evaluation and Research**  **2323 Broadway**  **Oakland, CA 94612** | **Maricela Pina** | Phone:  **(510) 861-5075** |
| E-Mail: **mpina@communitycer.com** |
| Prime Contractor: **Yes** |
| Subcontractor: **No** |
| Certified SLEB:  **No** |
| 2. | **Hatchuel Tabernik and Associates**  **2560 9th Street, Suite 211**  **Berkeley, CA 94710** | **Tim Tabernik** | Phone:  **(510) 559-3193 x223** |
| E-Mail: **ttabernik@htaconsulting.com** |
| Prime Contractor: **Yes** |
| Subcontractor: **No** |
| Certified SLEB: **Yes** |
| 3. | **RTI International**  **2150 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 800**  **Berkeley, CA 94704** | **Jay Feldman** | Phone:  **(510) 647-4318** |
| E-Mail: **jayfeldman@rti.org** |
| Prime Contractor: **No** |
| Subcontractor: **Undecided** |
| Certified SLEB:  **No** |
| 4. | **Liz Sullivan**  **1305 Lillian Avenue**  **San Leandro, CA 94578** | **Liz Sullivan** | Phone:  **(510) 858-8356** |
| E-Mail: **lizsullivan12@gmail.com** |
| Prime Contractor: **No** |
| Subcontractor: **Yes** |
| Certified SLEB:  **No** |
| 5. | **American Institute for Research**  **2400 Campus Drive**  **San Mateo, CA 94403** | **Vanessa Coleman** | Phone:  **(510) 295-5121** |
| E-Mail: **vcoleman@air.org** |
| Prime Contractor: **Yes** |
| Subcontractor: **No** |
| Certified SLEB:  **No** |
| 6. | **Hatchuel Tabernik and Associates**  **2560 9th Street, Suite 211**  **Berkeley, CA 94710** | **Lorana Allio** | Phone:  **(510) 559-3133** |
| E-Mail: **lallio@htaconsulting.com** |
| Prime Contractor: **Yes** |
| Subcontractor: **No** |
| Certified SLEB:  **Yes** |
| 7. | **RTI International**  **2150 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 800**  **Berkeley, CA 94704** | **Nitya Venkateswaran** | Phone:  **(510) 665-8249** |
| E-Mail: **nvenkateswaran@rti.org** |
| Prime Contractor: **No** |
| Subcontractor: **Undecided** |
| Certified SLEB:  **No** |

|  | **Company Name / Address** | **Representative** | **Contact Information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8. | **Community Centered Research and Evaluation**  **2349 92nd Avenue**  **Oakland, CA 94603** | **Nayeli Bernal** | Phone:  **(510) 508-0182** |
| E-Mail: **nayeli@communitycer.com** |
| Prime Contractor: **Yes** |
| Subcontractor: **No** |
| Certified SLEB:  **No** |
| 9. | **Consultant** | **Jamie Lopez** | Phone:  **(510) 301-1467** |
| E-Mail: **lopezzzjamie@gmail.com** |
| Prime Contractor: **No** |
| Subcontractor: **No** |
| Certified SLEB: **No** |
| 10. | **Engage R&D**  **Piedmont Avenue**  **Oakland, CA** | **Meghan Hunt** | Phone:  **(415) 870-4273** |
| E-Mail: **mhunt@engagerd.com** |
| Prime Contractor: **Yes** |
| Subcontractor: **No** |
| Certified SLEB:  **No** |
| 11. | **Harder & Company Community Research**  **299 Kansas Street**  **San Francisco, CA 94103** | **Nicole Brady** | Phone:  **(415) 522-5400** |
| E-Mail: **nbrady@harderco.com** |
| Prime Contractor:  **Yes** |
| Subcontractor: **No** |
| Certified SLEB:  **No** |

### EXHIBIT C

VENDOR LIST

RFP No. 901757 – Neighborhoods Ready for School Initiative

Below is the Vendor Bid List for this project consisting of vendors who have been issued a copy of this RFP. This Vendor Bid List is being provided for informational purposes to assist bidders in making contact with other businesses as needed to develop local small and emerging business subcontracting relationships to meet the requirements of the Small Local Emerging Business (SLEB) Program: <http://www.acgov.org/gsa/departments/purchasing/policy/slebpref.htm>.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFP No. 901757** | | | | | | | |
| **Business Name** | **Name** | **Phone** | **Address** | **City** | **ST.** | **Email** |
| American Institute for Research | Vanessa Coleman | (510) 295-5121 | 2400 Campus Drive | San Mateo | CA | vcoleman@air.org |
| Bright Research Group |  |  |  |  |  | [bohlson@brightresearchgroup.com](mailto:bohlson@brightresearchgroup.com) |
| Community Centered Research and Evaluation | Nayeli Bernal | (510) 508-0182 | 2349 92nd Avenue | Oakland | CA | [nayeli@communitycer.com](mailto:nayeli@communitycer.com) |
| Community Centered Research and Evaluation | Maricela Pina | (510) 861-5075 | 2323 Broadway | Oakland | CA | mpina@communitycer.com |
| Consultant | Jamie Lopez | (510) 301-1467 |  |  |  | lopezzzjamie@gmail.com |
| Engage R+D |  | (415) 870-4273 | Piedmont Avenue | Oakland | CA | [cnolan@engagerd.com](mailto:cnolan@engagerd.com) |
| Engage R+D | Meghan Hunt | (415) 870-4273 | Piedmont Avenue | Oakland | CA | [mhunt@engagerd.com](mailto:mhunt@engagerd.com) |
| Harder & Company Community Research | Nicole Brady | (415) 522-5400 | 299 Kansas Street | San Francisco | CA | [nbrady@harderco.com](mailto:nbrady@harderco.com) |
| Hatchuel Tabernik and Associates | Tim Tabernik | (510) 559-3193 x223 | 2560 9th Street Suite 211 | Berkeley | CA | ttabernik@htaconsulting.com |
| Hatchuel Tabernik and Associates | Lorana Allio | (510) 559-3193 | 2560 9th Street Suite 211 | Berkeley | CA | lallio@htaconsulting.com |
| Lisa Juachon |  |  |  |  |  | [lcjuachon@gmail.com](mailto:lcjuachon@gmail.com) |
| Liz Sullivan | Liz Sullivan | (510) 858-8356 | 1305 Lillian Avenue | San Leandro | CA | [lizsullivan12@gmail.com](mailto:lizsullivan12@gmail.com) |
| Partners for Collaborative Change |  |  |  |  |  | [info@collabchange.org](mailto:info@collabchange.org) |
| RTI International | Jay Feldman | (510) 647-4318 | 2150 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 800 | Berkeley | CA | jayfeldman@rti.org |
| RTI International |  | (510) 665-8249 | 2150 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 800 | Berkeley | CA | nvenkateswaran@rti.org |
| Resource Development Associates |  |  |  |  |  | [ahamburg@resourcedevelopment.net](mailto:ahamburg@resourcedevelopment.net) |
| Shiree Teng |  |  |  |  |  | [shireeteng@gmail.com](mailto:shireeteng@gmail.com) |