

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL - Secondary**California Arts Council JUMP StArts Program Evaluation
RFP #2016-02****QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC***Last edited: May 12, 2016 at 4:00pm*

Q: Have grantees been responsible for tracking any standard evaluation indicators across the board?

A: Though grantees have all been required to identify outcomes and metrics for evaluation prior to the start of their grant periods, these outcomes have been purposefully various. A central goal of this evaluation is an assessment of which sets of outcomes have been the most successfully achieved under what conditions. However, there are multiple existing standard data sets for all grantees that are available to assist evaluators in synthesizing outcomes, including grant guidelines and applications for all grant cycles, and final reports for FY 13-14 and FY 14-15 grantees. Please see the following links to the 2015-16 [Program Guidelines](#) and [Sample Application](#).

Q: What existing data are available to inform the evaluation? Are extant data the primary source of information to the quantitative and qualitative analysis of current and former grantees?

A: Existing data sets are contained in the documents listed above. They will represent primary sources of information around which the evaluator may base the analyses. Follow-up with organizations for further data or clarification of outcomes may be necessary.

Q: Is the development of a standard assessment an independent task or should the assessment be utilized to evaluate current and prior grantees?

A: As articulated in section A4 of the RFP, once developed, the evaluator should utilize the standard assessment tool for the evaluation of all JUMP StArts grantees.

Q: Have the most successful JUMP StArts programs for case studies already been identified? If not, will the California Arts Council identify these programs or will the evaluator develop criteria to identify these programs?

A: Model programs for the case studies will be identified by the evaluator based on the analysis of the standard assessment data, and in consultation with CAC staff.

Q: Are the program grantees aware of the evaluation and ready to share their data?

A: Prior to the evaluation contract start date, all current and prior grantees will receive formal communication from the CAC requesting their cooperation with all evaluation processes, including data sharing, consenting to interviews, and facilitating site visits.

Q: Will CAC staff be able to support the evaluation team in working with grantees?

A: *In addition to an official initial communication requesting cooperation, CAC staff will be available to support grantee interface throughout the evaluation process.*

Q: Item C.3. (p. 6) indicates that the budget is capped at \$20,000. Later, Item C.6. Note 5: Cost of Proposal (p. 8) gives bid examples ranging from \$35,000 to \$52,500. Is it correct to assume that the project budget is indeed \$20,000 and the latter is just a calculation example?

A: *Yes, that is correct.*

Q: Is it acceptable to submit a proposal outlining a more limited scope to be accomplished for \$20,000, plus a second budget scenario for the realistic cost of completing the entire proposed scope of work?

A: *Proposals that meet the minimum qualifications will be evaluated based on the criteria listed in RFP item C6. Proposals outlining a reduced scope from the RFP requirements will be rated accordingly. Secondary budget proposals will not be considered.*

Q: Are the only eligible entities current and past grantees of the program?

A: *Yes, the organizations to be targeted in this evaluation are the current and past grantees of the CAC JUMP StArts program.*

Q: Are individual researchers, such as those affiliated with universities, able to submit proposals?

A: *Any individual that meets the minimum expertise as indicated in the RFP is welcome to submit a proposal.*

Q: What is meant by "supplemented by input from the field" on page 3 under "Scope of Work/Goal of this RFP"?

A: *In addition to collecting data from the current and past JUMP StArts grantees, it is the goal of this evaluation to assess alignment of those outcomes with industry standard metrics in the field of arts and juvenile justice. The evaluators may use whatever means they deem appropriate to cull this data from the field.*

Q: Does this evaluation require human subjects/IRB approval?

A: *Whether or not IRB approval is necessary will be dependent on the evaluation methodology. If necessary, it would be up to the evaluator to secure such approval.*

Q: Who is the intended audience for the report? Will be shared internally or externally?

A: *While the primary goal of the evaluation is for the purposes of internal program review, the standard assessment tool will be shared externally.*

Q: Can the CAC provide more information here about the analysis expectations?

A: *It is our intention that this evaluation synthesize existing data sets from all current and past JUMP StArts grantees in order to inform the standard assessment tool. However, the three case studies should involve more in-depth analyses, including qualitatively-derived data (e.g. interviews, site visits, etc.) in order to reflect best practices with increased depth and nuance.*

Q: Does the CAC have expectations for the contractor(s) to be on site at the CAC at any time throughout the process (start up meeting, presenting final reports, meeting with grantees etc.) or is it expected that the CAC will work remotely with contractors?

A: The CAC welcomes remote interface with evaluators, or in-person meetings as geography permits. Whether or not the evaluator plans to do grantee site visits is dependent on the proposed methodology.

Q: Can data collection for the case studies be conducted virtually (e.g., phone or video format)?

A: While much of this data may be gathered virtually, in-person site visits may prove useful in conducting effective and thorough case studies. The evaluator should detail their proposed methodology in the work plan and schedule (section C2 of the proposal).

Q: For the demonstration of minimum requirements document, if the proposer is part of a firm, should these questions be answered to represent the firm overall or should the questions be answered relevant to the specific proposer? Is a combination of the two approaches acceptable?

A: Answers should reflect the experience of the specific proposer or evaluation team. If the specific proposer does not meet the minimum qualifications, he or she must be working in collaboration with partners that possess these qualifications in order to be eligible. All evaluation team members should include biographies as requested in section C2.