

Responses to Questions RFP # 03-19-20

1. Is it an option to have the evaluator be a contractor instead of a sub-recipient?

A. No, the evaluator must be a sub-recipient per institutional and Federal guidelines.

2. Regarding RFP 03-19-20, I am unclear whether this RFP is asking for (a) an evaluation of the current project or (b) the development of an evaluation plan for an upcoming proposal due November 2019. Is this an RFP for potential work if the new NSF application is funded? Or is there funding in this for development of the evaluation plan for the upcoming proposal? This begs the question: is there a current evaluator working on the project?

A. This RFP is requesting the development of an evaluation plan for the upcoming proposal due November 2019 as well as evaluation services if the new NSF application is funded. Funding will only be allotted upon award of the grant. Yes, there is a current evaluator working on the project.

3. "Provide details of your proposed remuneration to the College. Costs may not exceed 10% of the total proposed budget (anticipated at \$1.5 million), therefore **a fee structure for evaluation services may not exceed \$150,000.**"

Without knowing more about the project that will ultimately be proposed, we are uncertain how to provide details of our proposed remuneration. Am I misreading the request? Could you elaborate on the kinds of details required?

A. Please see RFP pp. 10-12, "Scope of Work," for more information on what activities should be included in the proposed remuneration/fee schedule. A breakdown of all proposed costs including personnel time, travel, etc. should be included.

4. Is there a page limit for Section 2 and Section 3 or for the overall proposal?

A. No

5. Can you provide a summary of the current evaluation plans in place for the B2B program (e.g., logic model, original grant)?

A. The current evaluation plans in place for the current B2B program follow the guidelines for evaluation established by the National Science Foundation and required in the LSAMP Bridges to Baccalaureate RFP. Namely, overall elements include, but are not limited to, qualitative and quantitative data collection, formative and summative evaluation, a logic model, and recommendations for improvement. However, the Alliance is open to a variety of evaluation plans that include or expand upon these elements.

6. Will the external evaluator be responsible for student-level data entry into WebAmp? If so, how many estimated students does the Alliance hope to serve?

A. No. The external evaluator is not responsible for student-level data entry into WebAmp, but does help define the structure of how and when data is collected.

7. Is the three year grant cycle from 12/1/2020 to 11/30/2023 competitive or an extension or renewal of the existing grant?

A. It is a competitive application to renew an existing program.

8. Who is providing the evaluation services for the remainder of the first three-year grant cycle?

A. The current external evaluator.

9. Is there a dedicated budget to support the development of the evaluation for your grant application? We see there is a total budget of 10% of the grant amount available for this work, but we weren't sure if that just covers activities if the grant is received, or if it also will be dedicated for the first phase of the work as well.

A. Funding will only be allotted upon award of the grant, and will be for evaluation activities during the grant period. Pre-application development activities are unfunded.

10. Is St. Petersburg College working with an evaluator for its current grant cycle? If so, will that evaluator be eligible to apply for this RFP?

A. Yes, SPC is working with a current evaluator. Yes, that evaluator is eligible to apply for the RFP.

11. What kind of activities has your B2B Alliance begun to implement in the first 2 years of your current grant? Will these activities and your 4 stated program goals continue for your new grant application? Or will new activities and goals be developed for the future grant period?

A. The Alliance team is in process of reviewing current goals as well as reviewing and developing activities for the new proposal cycle. Current activities align with NSF-recommended activities for STEM persistence and engagement, including informal learning communities, math supports, undergraduate research experiences, and faculty professional development.

12. What things have you been learning from the first 2 years of implementing the B2B Grant that will inform your thinking for the new grant cycle? Does the B2B Alliance have a logic model that they are operating under for the current grant-cycle? If so, what level of changes are you anticipating from the first cycle to the second?

A. No response.

13. What kind of data are you currently tracking for this initiative? What new data are you hoping to uncover in this new grant cycle?

A. Examples of data tracked includes student demographics, enrollment, program attendance, student success metrics, persistence and barriers to completion, and transfer rates. New data to uncover is still being determined.

14. What details are you looking for in the fee structure section of the proposal at this stage? For example, will it be sufficient to provide the total estimated cost for each of the two phases along with our hourly consultant rates?

A. Phase 1 is considered pre-award and as such is unfunded. The fee structure for post-award activities will need to include a breakdown of all costs (personnel, travel, etc.). An hourly rate and estimated number of hours can be included in addition to the cost breakdown.

15. Is SPC looking for any information about our approach or anticipated workplan at this stage?

A. Yes, SPC is interested in all information that would help to determine approach to evaluation during the three-year grant cycle and included elements (see response to Question 5).