



Questions and Response UAPB A199 MISRGO EVALUATOR

UAPB may request clarification of a question(s) or reserves the right not to respond to that question(s).

- Q. What is the maximum amount of funding allocated for the evaluation?
- A. \$50,000
- Q. What is the time period that will be evaluated?
- A. July 1 2024-June 30, 2025
- Q. How many sub-recipients were funded during the time period that will be evaluated?
- A. 9
- Q. Has there been any prior evaluation of MISRGO? If yes, are previous evaluators eligible to submit proposals for this RFP? If not, what has prompted this evaluation?
- A. Yes
- Q. Have the sub-recipients included in the evaluation concluded the funded activities?
- A. Yes
- Q. What data is included in the Grant Evaluation and Monitoring System (GEMS) that will be accessible to the contractor? (e.g., Arkansas Tobacco Surveys or other public health data sources)
- A. The evaluation system is now in Google. The selected vendor will be given access. Other data is public and can be accessed via the web.
- Q. Given the short start up time frame, what level of familiarity do sub-recipients and staff have about the evaluation that will take place?



- A. All staff and sub-grantees are familiar with evaluation methods and strategies.
- Q. Are the reviewers interested in a summative evaluation of each subrecipient independently, of MISRGO as a program or both?
- A. Both
- Q. Are specific outcomes prioritized for this evaluation (e.g., cessation rates, youth engagement, policy changes)?
- A. Some, but focused on the local level.
- Q. What is the scope for providing technical assistance to MISRGO and sub-recipients?
- A. Technical assistance is always welcome. Meetings (virtual and/or in person) can be scheduled to provide technical assistance.
- Q. For the required hard copies (5) of the Technical Proposal Packet and the electronic copy (1) of the Technical Proposal, are the materials required to be delivered by October 16, 2024 or post-marked by October 16, 2024?
- A. Please refer to page 1 of the bid package
- Q. Evaluation activities can be largely tailored to meet client priorities and budget. For example, qualitative data collection can be more expensive but provides depth to findings. What is the ideal budget or range for this project?
- A. Answer in question 1
- Q. How many programs does MISRGO operate and want included in this evaluation?
- A. 9 sub-recipients plus MISRGO
- Q. How many sub-recipient coordinators are there?
- A. 9 sub-recipient coordinators; 3 MISRGO staff that will have some interaction
- Q. Does MISRGO desire a logic model, evaluation plan, and report for each sub-recipient/program?



A. No logic model, but an outline of a plan. The report should include the sub-recipients and MISRGO overall (as it relates to the sub-recipients and some of MISRGO's programming).

Q. Our team specializes in culturally responsive and equitable evaluation (CREE) which would be important for a successful evaluation with the populations MISRGO works with. CREE requires working closely with communities to ensure their context and lived experiences focus the evaluation. CREE engages interest holders throughout the evaluation process and requires relationship building and intentionality. This takes more resources than purely quantitative/non-participatory evaluation approaches. Is culturally responsive and equitable evaluation a priority for MISRGO?

A. Not a specific priority; however in the realm of working with the MISRGO population (sub-recipients), the answer is yes.

Q. How will Budget and Cost Explanation points awarded take into consideration various scopes of work and budgets? For example, a simply survey would be very cost effective, but may not meet all of your goals

A. Please refer to Section 5 – Criteria for Selection for Budget and Cost points

Q. Does the bid packet need to include three written references from the referrers, or just contact information for the referrers?

A. Technical Packet needs (2) references, fill out the requested information.

Q. If another UA system institution applies, does this change any of the required documents, for example, the certificate of insurance or liability requirements?

A. Yes, no required documents will be needed if it is a UA System institution.

Q. Can you clarify the correct address that the proposal needs to be submitted to? The address provided on the label in the technical packet does not match the address provided in the "Submit To" section of the RFP cover page.

A. Either address will suffice, please refer to the bid on page 1

Q. Can you clarify if the Costing Section document provided in the Technical packet is that same as the "Official Bid Price Sheet" listed in the RFP (Pg.5). Additionally, can you clarify if this is the same as the "vi. Budget and Cost Explanation" (RFP pg. 17 and 20")



A. Yes, the Costing Sheet is the bid sheet.

Q. The URL address provided in the RFP regarding checking the UAPB website for Addenda is broken (pg. 8). Can you provide an updated link?

A. <https://uapb.edu/administration/finance-administration/purchasing/bid-opportunities/#request-for-proposals>

Q. Does the Official bid price sheet need to be included in the Technical Proposal Packet? Page 4 of the RFP indicates that it does. However, Page 5 indicates it must be separately sealed from the Technical Proposal Packet.

A. The Costing Sheet needs to be separately sealed from the Technical Proposal Packet

Q. Is the “Bid Response Packet” the Same as the “Technical Response Packet”? (RFP pg 4)

A. Yes