



Iowa Department of Human Services

Kim Reynolds
Governor

Adam Gregg
Lt. Governor

Jerry R. Foxhoven
Director

Request for Proposal ACFS 19-002 Community Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention (CAPP) Administrative Services

January 24, 2018 - Respondent Questions and Agency Responses:

This document includes all questions that were received by the Agency in response to the above identified RFP.

- Table 1 below lists all questions that were received by the Agency during the January 3rd, 2018 Bidder's Conference, in accordance with RFP section 2.6, *Bidders' Conference*. The Agency response to these questions has also been provided
- Table 2 below lists all questions that were submitted to the Agency in writing and in accordance with the terms outlined in RFP section 2.7, *Questions, Requests for Clarification, and Suggested Changes*. The Agency response to these questions has also been provided

TABLE 1 – RFP Section 2.6, *Bidders' Conference*. "... to provide Bidders' an opportunity to ask questions regarding the RFP."

| Bidders' Conference Questions | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| Question | | Agency Response | RFP Reference |
| 1. | Are there bid proposal formatting requirements for spacing – single spacing or double spacing? | No, there is not a requirement for spacing. Proposal may be single spaced. | Section 3.1, Bid Proposal Formatting |
| 2. | Will the evaluation contract go out for rebid in 2020? | The current evaluation contract was procured through an inter-governmental agreement that does not require competitive bid. The current contract term ends on 06/30/18 with the option of two additional 1-year renewals. A new contract must be procured for evaluation services beginning 7/1/2020. | Section 1.1.2 Evaluation |

Bidders' Conference Questions Continued...

| Question | | Agency Response | RFP Reference |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 3. | Do you anticipate any changes to the scope of work in this RFP or resulting contract in the upcoming legislative session? | At this time the Agency is not aware of any legislation that would impact the scope of work in this RFP or a resulting contract. | Section 1.3, Scope of Work; and Section 2.9 Amendment to the RFP and Bid Proposal |
| 4. | Can we access the current state TANF plan? | Yes. The current state TANF plan is available on the DHS website at the link provided below. The current state TANF plan is effective 10/1/16 thru 9/30/19. http://dhs.iowa.gov/can-we-help/cash-assistance/TANF | Funding Source |
| 5. | Will the Scope of Work change for grantees for their final year of current contracts? | No, the Agency does not anticipate significant changes to the scope of work for Project Grantees. | Section 1.1.3, CAPP Program Grantees; |
| 6. | Is there a transition plan to maintain the current training and technical assistance being provided to the CAPP grantee contractors? | In accordance with the Deliverables outlined in Section 1.3.1.2.1 (B), the Contractor shall provide training, including (b) Model specific training. In accordance with Section 3.2.4, Bidders shall address within their proposals how they intend to meet each deliverable. Attachment K lists the current models being used by each CAPP grantee. | Section 1.3.1.2.1(B), Program Support and Technical Assistance; Section 3.2.4, Information to Include Behind Tab 4: Bidder's Approach to Meeting Deliverables; and Attachment K CAPP Grantees SFY 2017 |
| 7. | Who will serve as evaluators for bids under this RFP and what is their level of expertise in this area? | To help preserve the integrity of the procurement process and to ensure a comprehensive, fair and impartial evaluation, the Agency will not release this information until after a Notice of Intent to Award has been issued. | Section 2.2 Restriction on Communication; and Section 4, Evaluation of the Bid Proposals Section |

TABLE 2 – RFP Section 2.7, Questions, Requests for Clarification, and Suggested Changes, “Bidders who have provided their intent to bid on the RFP are invited to submit written questions, requests for clarifications, and/or suggestions for changes to the specifications of this RFP (hereafter “Questions”) ...” “... Bidders shall address any perceived ambiguity regarding this RFP through the question and answer process.”

| Bidders’ Written Questions | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Question | | Agency Response | RFP Reference |
| 1. | The RFP states that the successful bidder <u>shall</u> implement the recommendations of the evaluation contractor. The recommendations cited say “consider...” Is the requirement for the successful bidder “to consider the recommendations of the evaluation contractor” or to implement the recommendations? | <p>Section 1.1 Background shares general information on the Program’s background and relevant data. In accordance with Section 3.2.4, Bidders shall address within their proposals how they intend to meet each deliverable in Section 1.3, Scope of Work.</p> <p>Note that Scope of Work Section 1.3.1.2.1(C)(d)(vi)(3) states the following:</p> <p><i>“Contractor shall consider recommendations made by the Program Evaluator (Attachment M) in preparing their Program model and identifying which specific models/curricula may be used by Grantees.”</i></p> <p>The RFP does not require Bidders respond to Section 1.1 Background. See First Amendment to ACFS 19-003 for clarification on Section 1.1 Background.</p> | Section 1.1.2, Evaluation, Pg. 5 |
| 2. | Two of the evaluation contractor’s recommendations in Attachment M (Rec. 2 rigorous evaluation and Rec. 3 curriculum development) require substantial funding. For instance, the Office of Adolescent Health currently funds curriculum rigorous evaluation at approximately \$1 million per year. Is additional funding going to be made available to assist bidders in meeting this requirement or will CSBR’s contract be increased to perform this work? | <p>See Table 2, question 1. Funding for this Contract is identified in the Introduction on page 2 of the RFP.</p> <p>In accordance with Section 3.2.4, Bidders shall address within their proposals how they intend to meet each deliverable of this RFP in Section 1.3, Scope of Work.</p> | Section 1.1.2, Evaluation, Pg. 5 |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| 3. | Please clarify why the RFP appears to discount a trend of 10 years of consistent drops in Iowa's teen birth rate while emphasizing a 1% increase in the teen birth rate in 2016 (which may or may not be the start of a trend). | See First Amendment to ACFS 19-003. The RFP has not discounted the trend, but rather it points out a recent shift in that previous downward trend. Language has been added to clarify and remove the word "trend" per the Bidder's suggestion. | Section 1.1.5, Pg. 7 |
| 4. | "The Agency will not exclude the proposed use of any program models with demonstrated evidence of effectiveness in the prevention of Adolescent pregnancy." What will the standard be for determining effectiveness of strategies and who will determine it? | <p>See First Amendment to ACFS 19-003 to correct a technical error to the section number (corrected to 1.1.6). This Section also states:</p> <p><i>"In addition, for more information on federally approved programs with evidence in the prevention of Adolescent pregnancy, please refer to the following website maintained by the United States Department of Health and Human Services: https://tppevidencereview.aspe.hhs.gov/EvidencePrograms.aspx"</i></p> <p>Section 1.1 Background shares general information on the Program's background and relevant data. In accordance with Section 3.2.4, Bidders shall address within their proposals how they intend to meet each deliverable in Section 1.3, Scope of Work.</p> | Section 1.1.6 (amended to correct duplicate section number 1.1.5), Pg. 10 |
| 5. | Is the PSA supposed to be targeted to all those listed (adolescents, parents, youth serving professionals mentors, etc.)? | <p>See First Amendment to ACFS 19-003 to correct a technical error to the section number (corrected to 1.1.6).</p> <p>Section 1.1 Background shares general information on the Program's background and relevant data. In accordance with Section 3.2.4, Bidders shall address within their proposals how they intend to meet each deliverable in Section 1.3, Scope of Work.</p> <p>Statements under this section include the following:</p> <p><i>"The Contractor shall <u>consider</u> a variety of different media/communication formats."</i></p> | Section 1.1.6 (amended to correct duplicate section number 1.1.5), Pg. 11 |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|----------------------------|
| | | <p><i>“The Contractor shall <u>consider</u> traditional media and marketing methods (PSAs, handouts, etc.), as well as non-traditional media and marketing methods (social media, web-based applications, etc.).”</i></p> <p><i>“The Contractor shall implement the statewide media/communication plan, which <u>may include</u>, but not necessarily be limited to:</i></p> <p><i>i. Development and use of Public Service Announcements (PSAs) targeted to teens, parents, <u>or</u> youth-serving professionals;”</i></p> <p>Bidders have wide latitude in addressing this deliverable within their Bid Proposals.</p> | |
| 6. | If the needs assessment identifies other or additional needs for adolescent pregnancy prevention beyond those identified in the RFP, will the Contractor be able to renegotiate years’ 2-6 scope of work and budget? | The Agency does not anticipate modifying the Deliverables or funding of any awarded Contract. | Section 1.3.1.1, Pg. 16 |
| 7. | Will CSBR be able to increase their SFY 19 scope of work and budget in order to assist with the needs assessment? | This question is outside of the Scope of Work of this RFP. | Section 1.3.1.1, Pg. 16 |
| 8. | After noon on February 12, 2018 are bidders allowed to communicate with other state employees about this RFP and does the restriction on communication include Wendy Rickman? | <p>No. Per the RFP, section 2.2, <i>Restrictions on Communication</i>, “From the issue date of this RFP until announcement of the successful Bidder, the Issuing Officer is the point of contact regarding the RFP. There may be no communication regarding this RFP with any State employee other than the Issuing Officer, except at the direction of the Issuing Officer or as otherwise noted in the RFP.”</p> <p>Wendy Rickman is a State employee.</p> | Section 2.13.2, Pg. 32 |
| 9. | <p>Potential Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Transition Plan, second bullet that says –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Bidder indicates they are a | No. Per section 1.2, RFP General Definitions, a “Project Grantee” is defined as, “...the organizations and subcontractors that have been awarded funding by the | Subsection 3.2.4.1, Pg. 38 |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| | <p>current Project Grantee (or subcontractor), they must include a transition plan to reassign any Project funds to other organizations in SFY 2019. The plan shall indicate how the Bidder would ensure there is no gap in local services as a result.</p> <p>Does this apply to the current contractor (EOI)?</p> | <p><i>Agency for individual Projects under the Program. Project Grantees are chosen by the local Community Coalition to act as the lead organization in local service provision."</i></p> | |
| 10. | <p>"If a bidder proposes more than one method of meeting the RFP requirements, each method must be drafted and submitted as separate Bid proposals." Can you define "method" as it is used in this sentence?</p> | <p>For the purposes of this RFP, "method" means, a specific plan for accomplishing or approaching the defined scope of work within the defined budget parameters.</p> | <p>Section 3.2, Contents and Organization of Technical Proposals, Subsection 3.2.4, Pg. 38</p> |
| 11. | <p>For the letters of reference requirement are we able to submit more than three letters, including letters from national organizations that can speak to our expertise?</p> | <p>Bidders are able to submit more than three letters of reference as long as letters meet the requirements in RFP Section 3.2, subsection 3.2.5.1.4.</p> | <p>Section 3.2, Contents and Organization of Technical Proposals, Subsection 3.2.5, Pg. 39</p> |
| 12. | <p>Regarding the budget to be submitted by the bidder, is the bidder supposed to show 100% of all the bidder organization's expenses or just those that relate to the work under this RFP? If similar services are provided under other funding should those be shown?</p> | <p>Per the Instructions provided in Attachment J:</p> <p><i>"Funding for this Contract is 100% Federal TANF Block Grant funding and subject to Code of Federal Regulations at Title 45, Subtitle A, Subchapter A, Part 75. Subrecipients must allocate costs equitable to federal sources and are, therefore, <u>asked to include all Bidder "Indirect Costs" (including shared expenses). Indicate the full salary and benefits of ALL employees to be funded under this Contract (in full or part). In addition, indicate the percentage of time anticipated on this Scope of Work for each employee and the amount and source of other funding (other funding sources shall</u></i></p> | <p>Section 3.3, Cost Proposal, Pg. 39 – 40; Example Cost Proposal, Pg. Pg. 41 – 45; and Attachment J</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|
| | | <p><u>be identified in narrative section provided). In addition, for any other shared expenses, indicate the full amount, including the amount charged to this Contract and the amount paid for through other funding sources.}</u></p> <p>Per the instructions, ALL Indirect Costs (i.e., Facilities and Administration) must be provided and ALL direct shared costs must be provided. Therefore if similar services are provided with additional funding that is being used to supplement expenses anticipated under this contract (e.g. a shared full time position, shared material/equipment expenses, etc.), yes, the other funding shall be included.</p> | |
| 13. | Regarding the budget, can the allocation of costs be based on a % of the entire budget? | <p>See Section 1.5.2, Cost Restrictions which states:</p> <p>“Information on Allowable Costs, Cost Principles, Cost Allocation, and other relevant items can be located here: https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?node=pt45.1.75”</p> <p>Specifically “Allocable Costs” is addressed in §75.405 at the link provided.</p> <p>Yes, allocation of costs can be based on a percentage of funding compared to a Bidder’s overall organizational expenses.</p> | Section 1.5.2, Cost Restrictions, Pg. 27; Section 3.3, Cost Proposal, Pg. 39 – 40; Example Cost Proposal, Pg. 41 – 45; and Attachment J |
| 14. | How will the Agency ensure that adolescent pregnancy prevention expertise is represented on the evaluation committee? | The Agency selects knowledgeable committee members and requires all members of the evaluation team to attend a training prior to receiving proposals for the purposes of understanding the review and evaluation process and gaining understanding of what the Agency seeks to purchase through the RFP. | Section 4.2, Evaluation Committee, Pg. 46 |
| 15. | Will the Agency ensure that the evaluation committee includes members from outside state agencies? | The Agency is not required to ensure that the evaluation committee includes members from outside state agencies. | Section 4.2, Evaluation Committee, Pg. 46 |
| 16. | The budget worksheet is not tabulating all the way over to the total (cells F63 and F64). | Please see the First Amendment to RFP ACFS 19-002, Community Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Administration Services and amended Attachment J. | Attachment J |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 17. | <p>I'm reading through the evaluation report provided by University of Northern Iowa and included as Attachment M in the CAPP Administrative Services RFP. It appears there is narrative missing under this following item:</p> <p>"4. Continue to promote comprehensive sexual health education curricula as part of a larger constellation of outreach activities to promote community-wide change."</p> <p>Is there any narrative that helps address what type of specific outreach activities were recommended by UNI as provided in Attachment M and outlined in bullet point 4?</p> | <p>Upon clarification of the Program Evaluator, this was intentional and the supporting paragraph was intended to address both Recommendations 4 and 5. There is no additional narrative.</p> | Attachment M |
| 18. | <p>Is the intent to open the program for abstinence-only programs and if not, why are these programs not explicitly excluded?</p> | <p>The intent of the Program is to reduce Adolescent pregnancy. Per the RFP, services eligible for funding are identified in Iowa Code and Iowa Admin. Code. Specifically Iowa Acts 2017, Chapter 174 (House File 653) states "grant programs must emphasize sexual abstinence". This statutory language has been consistent since the Program's inception.</p> | Section 1.1 Background, Pg. 3-4 |
| 19. | <p>Are bidders encouraged to focus solely on the identified target teen and parent populations or should bidders include, with equal emphasis, services and programming for the broad teen population?</p> | <p>Per the RFP, Iowa Acts specifically states that, <i>"Priority in the awarding of grants shall be given to programs that serve areas of the state which demonstrate the highest percentage of unplanned pregnancies of females of childbearing age within the geographic area to be served by the grant."</i></p> <p>The Agency has not set any limits or requirements that the Program <i>only</i> serve identified target populations. However, prioritizing high risk populations has always been a Program requirement. In accordance with Section 3.2.4, Bidders shall address within their proposals how they intend to meet each deliverable. Therefore, Bidders shall address, within their proposals, how they intend to prioritize target populations.</p> | Section 1.1 Background, Pg. 3-4; and Section 3.2.4, Information to Include Behind Tab 4: Bidder's Approach to Meeting Deliverables, Pg. 37-38; |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 20. | The Agency adopted Rules pursuant to chapter 17A to implement CAPP. The Rules are being updated. Will the Agency make a draft copy of those Rules available for bidders or provide a draft summary of them? | The Agency established rule for the Program that is located in Iowa Admin. Code Ch. 441—163. The Agency has not noticed or filed any changes to this chapter. There are no draft copies or summaries to provide. A link to the current Iowa Administrative Code Chapter 441-163 is on page 4 of the RFP: https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/iac/chapter/07-02-2008.441.163.pdf | |
| 21. | Is there a strategy to highlight what is working with CAPP? This is a section that could add value and be an asset to all bidders. | Attachment F includes CAPP grantee feedback, Attachment L includes the last full annual evaluation report for the program, and Attachment M includes a review of curricula by the Program Evaluator. Bidders are encouraged to review all these materials in preparing their Bid Proposals. | Attachment F; Attachment L; and Attachment M |
| 22. | In alignment with national best practices, the SFY 13 Administrative RFP (ACFS-13007) directly and indirectly acknowledged the important role of sexual health education for teens and expected bidders to include this as a core strategy. Why does the current RFP not include sexual health education as a core strategy? | <p>The current RFP states Program models must comply with Iowa Administrative Code, including the following CAPP Project requirements identified in IAC 441—163 and quoted verbatim on page 4-5:</p> <p><i>b. Comprehensive programming focusing on the prevention of initial pregnancies during the adolescent years. Projects may provide one or more of the following services:</i></p> <p><i>(1) Workshops and informational programs for adolescents and parents of adolescents to improve communication between children and parents regarding human sexuality issues.</i></p> <p><i>(2) Programs that focus on the prevention of initial pregnancies through responsible decision making in relationships. <u>These programs should be comprehensive with emphasis on, but not limited to, abstinence, risks associated with drug and alcohol use, contraceptives and associated failure rates, sexually transmitted diseases, and AIDS.</u></i></p> <p><i>(3) Programs which use peer counseling or peer education techniques for the prevention of adolescent pregnancies.</i></p> <p><i>(4) <u>Development and distribution of informational</u></i></p> | Section 1.1 Background, Pg. 3-4; Section 1.1.1 Community Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention (CAPP) Program Overview, Pg. 4-5; Section 1.1.4 Administration and Current Program Requirements, Pg. 6; and Section 1.1.6 (amended to correct duplicate section number), Agency Goals for the CAPP Program, Pg. 9 – 11; |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|------------------------------------|
| | | <p><u>material designed to discourage adolescent sexual activity, to provide information regarding acquired immune deficiency syndrome and sexually transmitted diseases, and to encourage male and female adolescents to assume responsibility for their sexual activity and parenting.</u></p> <p>Sexual health education with teens is identified as a specific strategy within both #2 and #4 under the section of “comprehensive programming”. The RFP does not state that sexual health is not a core strategy; just that it is not the only strategy within a comprehensive program. Further, the RFP states that:</p> <p><i>“Bidders are encouraged to develop and propose their own unique Program structure, <u>assuming the requirements identified in Iowa Acts and Iowa Administrative Code (see Section 1.1.3) are included</u> and that the approach results in the desired outcomes of the Agency.”</i></p> <p>The RFP also specifically states (page 10):</p> <p><i>“While Comprehensive Sex Education is an important component to preventing Adolescent pregnancy, the Agency views this as one strategy within a broader array of comprehensive services geared toward youth at Risk for Adolescent pregnancy.”</i></p> | |
| 23. | What is the Agency’s plan to assist youth and the 120 school districts that are currently served by local CAPP grantee agencies to access sexual health education should the successful bidder not include teen sexual health education as a core strategy? | <p>See Answer to previous question.</p> <p>The Agency and the Program are not tasked with providing sexual health education support to school districts.</p> | |
| 24. | What organizations submitted a Letter of Intent? | <p>The Agency received Letters of Intent to Bid from the following Organizations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevent Child Abuse Iowa | Section 2.5, Intent to Bid, Pg. 30 |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| | | 2. Eyes Open Iowa 3. Community Youth Concepts | |
| 25. | What is the Agency procedure to address the possibility that a bidder was given privileged information about this RFP? | If there are concerns bidders are asked to contact the issuing officer with details for the Agency to review. | |
| 26 | Will there be a second RFP issued for an entity to provide services to non-CAPP funded areas of the state and school districts? | See Table 2, question 23. This question is outside of the Scope of Work of this RFP. | |
| 27. | Will there be a second RFP issued for services that provide training and skill development for educators providing sexual health and education to young people? | See Table 2, question 23. This question is outside of the Scope of Work of this RFP. | |

