



PHILIP L. BROWNING
Director

County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

425 Shatto Place, Los Angeles, California 90020
(213) 351-5602

Board of Supervisors

HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

March 19, 2015

Dear Prospective Proposer and Interested Parties:

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED AT THE PUBLIC/STAKEHOLDERS' CONFERENCE FOR FAMILY PRESERVATION AND PARTNERSHIPS FOR FAMILIES CATEGORIES UNDER THE SAFE CHILDREN AND STRONG FAMILIES CONTINUUM OF SERVICES

Attached, are the responses to public comments received on February 19, 2015 at the Public/Stakeholders' Conference for Family Preservation (FP) and Partnerships for Families (PFF) categories under the Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Continuum of Services.

The comments and questions received at the aforementioned event ranged from areas involving program design; the contractor selection process; required forms; hours of operation; etc. The Department will consider these comments during the final development of the Statements of Work and Sample Contracts to be included in the upcoming solicitation document. However, the Department reserves the right to make the final decision.

All prospective proposers and interested parties will have an opportunity to ask questions during the Written Questions and Answer period and at the Proposers' Conference of the upcoming solicitation.

Please continue to monitor the Department's website <http://lacdcfs.org/contracts/index.html> for a second Public/Stakeholders' Conference tentatively scheduled for the week of April 13, 2015.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the County of Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Leticia Torres-Ibarra, Division Manager
Contracts Administration Division

LTI:DLM:AO:ao

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

PROGRAM

1. No mention about point of engagement; service delivery (e.g. SPA 6) ref. Casey review (2002-2012) L.A. County recognized as a National leader. Don't reinvent the wheel. AFCARS report supported by Casey report.
Response: The Department of Children and Family Services (Department) has adopted the Core Practice Model as our service delivery system.
2. Continue to be connected to community agencies (e.g. Faith-based, Boys & Girls club, etc.) IMPORTANT! **(More than 3 attendees feel this is important)**
Response: The idea of maintaining connections with our community is supported. We are open to contracting with all service providers and community agencies, including our Faith-based agencies and Boys and Girls Clubs. Our Contractors are required to have offices/facilities in the areas in which their contracts are awarded. In addition, Contractors may establish linkages with faith-based agencies and other service providers for services not available with the primary agency.
3. Rates should be based on cost studies/Rates outdated.
Response: We will review the current rates for Family Preservation services.
4. (Section 7.2) Intensive Family Preservation (IFP): Child & Family Team (CFT) is required to change to regular FP. Can this be done through Multidisciplinary Case Planning Committee (MCPC)?
Response: Yes, the decision to move into or out of the IFP program may be determined in any team meeting where all case participants are at the table. There are plans to amend SOW to indicate that CFTs and MCPCs are equivalent.
5. (Section 7.1.8.3) Clarify Coordination Service Action Team (CSAT) process for ARS closed cases. How are we expected to monitor closed cases using form 305?
Response: There is no Mental Health contract for ARS cases. Therefore, the 305 is not applicable to these cases. The expectation is that Contractors make every effort in linking families in need of mental health services to the appropriate community mental health services, even if a DMH 305 form is not utilized. Such efforts shall be documented in the file. There are plans to amend the language.

If there is a positive CSAT for a child on a Family Preservation case, they should have been referred to Specialized Foster care by the DCFS CSW for linkage to a Mental Health provider. Upon successful linkage or other outcome the last CSW of record would be notified as well as the Service Linkages Specialist of the identified office. Family Preservation staff can contact the last CSW or the SLS for an update as to the identified client. Also, as stated in the SOW, please refer to <http://ladcfs.org/katieA/csate> website for further details.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

6. Standardized process of training where agencies can attend and receive training credit/hours towards requirement of 8 hours per quarter. **(More than 3 attendees feel this is important).**

Response: Contractors have been designated to determine the training needs of their staff and volunteers. In order to individualize the training process for each agency the Department has determined that each agency would be most effective at designing a training curriculum to cover those areas they identify as deficient or of need. In Section 9.3.1 of the SOW, the minimum required training topics are outlined. Although not a part of the SOW, Contractors may utilize the Learning Collaborative as a resource for providing standardized training for all agencies and receive 8 hours quarterly training credit. FP Learning Network is a quarterly training opportunity for FP agencies to share best practice and receive specific training on various topics selected by the FP agencies.

7. (Section 7.2.9) Intensive Family Preservation (IFP) what is meant by “consecutively” (i.e. T&D worker visit)?

Response: The SOW states that base rate IHOC and supplemental services shall not be provided consecutively within one business day. The Department's expectation is that two IHOC visit shall not be made on the same day. The language will be amended to reflect this clearly.

8. Family Assessment Form (FAF) duplicating services – Attachment #14 or FAF? **(More than 3 attendees feel this is important)**

Response: Exhibit A-14 is the MCPC Plan/Monthly Progress Reports. These documents will be generated from the Family Assessment Form (FAF) website and replace Exhibit A-13, Exhibit A-14, and Exhibit A-16. Also, Exhibits A-8, Exhibits A-17, Exhibit A-18 and Exhibit A-19 will be replaced by a new form in the FAF.

9. Stick with 30 day FAF instead of 5 business days ARS, 15 business days for regular FP.

Response: FAF assessment process will require CONTRACTORS to utilize multiple visits with the family as well as consultation with supervisors; therefore, the SOW language will be changed to reflect that CONTRACTORS have 30 days to complete the initial MCPC.

10. Why will the new form A-7 be required?

Response: The requirement will be omitted from the SOW.

11. Why refer to parenting services as “supplemental services”? Should be base rate services. (Pre-judging what's important)

Response: All the supplemental services were listed in order to give the agencies the ability to bill for specific services that MAY be needed for a family. The base rate services are the MINIMUM required. Not all cases will necessarily need parenting services.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

12. Should be not-fee-for service but with targeted goals. Instead of fee-for-service cost reimbursement instead? **(More than 3 attendees feel this is important)**

Response: The core services are reimbursed as a flat base rate and supplemental services are fee-for service. The fee rate was designed this way to ensure that there is a consistent payment for the minimum required services and at the same time provide the agencies the ability to bill for additional services as needed.

13. No reference made to domestic violence services and anger management. There are degreed, certified staff that can provide this service. Only parenting referenced in counseling section.

Response: Section 7.2.19.3. in the SOW identifies counseling as follows:
Face-to-face meetings/interventions by a counselor with an individual, couple, family or group to: 1) help identify and assist in solving family problems; 2) identify substance abuse and refer for treatment; 3) address and treat domestic violence or anger management issues; and 4) help identify personal, vocational and educational goals. The IHOC shall not provide counseling to MCPC Service Plan participants assigned to their caseload. These services must be provided by 1) a Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) with a current license from the California Board of Behavioral Sciences; or 2) a Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist (LMFT) with a current license from the California Board of Behavioral Sciences; or 3) a licensed Psychologist with a current license from the California Board of Psychology; or 4) a Master's/Doctoral level registered Intern under Clinical Supervision by a LCSW, LMFT, or licensed Psychologist. All counseling shall be documented on Counseling Notes, Exhibit A-19, including the client's progress towards ARS / FP MCPC Service Plan Agreement goals.

Specific language will be added to clarify billing categories with a definition of each that will include anger management. The 52 week programs will be considered separately.

In addition, we will add that agencies should seek all services through Medi-Cal prior to utilizing their FP allocation.

Also please refer to answer #22.

14. DCFS shouldn't be the "fall guy." There are other partners who have a role in County-based services (Probation, DMH).

Response: The Department is one of many County agencies that have the role of securing the safety of children in partnership with community partners. The Office of Child Protection will also play a role in coordinating all County Departments and their roles in ensuring the safety of children.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

15. Include all ages in the home. Need all on-board for service provision. Back up that entire family is being served.

Response: Family Preservation services are open to all ages and include all family members who voluntarily accept these services.

16. Collaborate with the Department of Health and Department of Social Services.

Response: The Department currently collaborates with the Department of Health and has dedicated Public Health Nurses in all regional offices that participate in CFTs to assist in developing a Family's case plan. The Department also collaborates with the Department of Public Social Services with our Linkages Program with dedicated Linkages staff out stationed in Regional offices that also collaborate with our Family Preservation Agencies.

17. Court-approved helps to set a rate to provide these services

Response: Please review answer to question #3.

18. Can we use both paid and intern staff?

Response: Yes. Please refer to section 9.2 of the SOW for the details as follows: CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for securing and maintaining staff who meet the minimum qualifications below and who possess sufficient experience and expertise required to provide services in this SOW. CONTRACTOR shall be responsible to ensure staff are allotted sufficient time to complete their identified tasks and available to CPM, if applicable. CONTRACTOR shall obtain written verification for staff with foreign degrees that the degrees are recognized as meeting established standards and requirements of an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Any foreign degrees or qualifications will need to be evaluated through a Credential Evaluation Service at the agency's cost. For licensure, staff will need to go through the state's licensing board relevant to their degree to ensure they meet the requirements. The agency and DCFS will determine on a case by case basis what will be accepted. CONTRACTOR shall ensure the same requirements are met with its Subcontractors.

9.2.9 Intern: A student in a Bachelors or Masters program in the field of Social Work or related field being supervised by a professional staff.

9.2.10 Registered Intern: A student who holds a Masters degree in Social Work or related field under the supervision of a Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) or Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist (LMFT) or Licensed Psychologist AND registered with the Licensing Board applicable to the field of study.

19. (Section 9.3.4) Reporting incidents within 24 hours; what if you can't obtain consent from client within 24 hours? (reference sow language)

Response: There is no need to obtain consent from the client if incidents are being reported to County Program Manager (CPM). At the start of all Family Preservation

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

services, the family is to sign a consent form DCFS 802, providing consent for Contractors and community agencies to provide and exchange information with the Department. Without this consent, services cannot be provided and families are not referred for Family Preservation services.

We will amend the language of the SOW to include the need for the 800 and the 802 (consent form) be signed prior to referring to the CONTRACTORS for Family Preservation Services.

20. (Section 6.1.1) Emergency Response Command Post (ERCP) – Clarification on when the clock starts the process. Report due within 24 hours of assessing family from time family is assessed or from time you receive faxed referral form?

Response: As stated in the SOW, the time to respond to the location of the client is one hour (unless other arrangements are made by CSW/SCSW). The clock starts from the time the agency receives the phone call from ERCP. The report is due to DCFS 24 hours after the assessment is completed.

We will revise the SOW language to reflect the above.

21. FAF with psychosocial: Too many additional reports; duplicating work

Response: There will be only one psychosocial tool for FP/ARS cases and this tool is included in the FAF. We will continue to use the BSAP tool for UFA assessments.

22. Inconsistencies with language of staff titles and requirements. Project Manager, Program Manager versus Contract Program Director (CPD) & Please define “credentialed instructor” for staff providing parenting training. Can this be done 1-1 in addition to one-hour IHOC visit and also offered as group parenting classes. (Both not done at the same time with one family).

Response: Adding the staff titles to Attachment O which lists all definitions in the contract will be considered. The language in the SOW will be amended to clarify the education/certification/credential requirements for supplemental service providers.

23. Clarify discretionary funds.

Response: Section 7.2 and 7.3 in the MAIN contract references the Discretionary funds as follows: CONTRACTOR may use up to five percent (5%) of the annual allocation amount for discretionary services/items. CONTRACTOR must obtain prior written approval from the COUNTY Program Manager for any Discretionary Services expenditures estimated to be in the excess of two thousand, five hundred dollars (\$2,500) for any individual item, event, activity or service.

24. Electronic forms (like wraparound).

Response: We will consider providing all CONTRACTORS with electronic forms.

25. RFP needs a transition plan. Old to new agencies; how do we prepare for this?

Response: Please refer to Section 8.5 of the SOW:

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

Prior to Contract termination or non-renewal of Contract, CONTRACTORS shall, at no additional cost to COUNTY, cooperate in transitioning active cases which are to new CONTRACTORS, including providing all original case files and electronic records. CONTRACTOR shall keep copies of all transferred cases for their own records. The transitional plan shall be made in consultation with the COUNTY Program Manager at least one month in advance of the Contract termination or as soon as possible in the event of non-renewal.

8.5.1 At the start of a new Contract, CONTRACTOR shall accept transitioned cases from prior CONTRACTORS. The new CONTRACTOR shall submit a plan of coverage to the CPM for the transitioned cases within 30 days of the start of the new Contract or within 30 days of receipt of transitioned cases from the prior CONTRACTOR. The plan of coverage shall include (1) telephonic contact with the family within three weeks of the 30 day transitional period, (2) a face-to-face contact with the family within five business days from the telephonic contact, and (3) an initial case plan for the family within 30 days from the initial face-to-face contact with the family.

26. (Section 7.2.20) Auxiliary funds definition is vague – mentions furniture, moving costs, utility payments, rental assistance, etc. Exhibit A-21 – procedural guide mentions other items that can be purchased. Very different from definition of auxiliary funds.

a. (Exhibit A-21) Security deposit return form not referenced. Further clarification is needed.

Response: We will provide a definition of Auxiliary funds in this section and in Attachment O – Definitions page.

27. (Sections 9.2.2 and 9.2.3) Paraprofessional staff and Professional staff both require a minimum Bachelors degree. What's the difference?

Response: Paraprofessional staff and Professional Staff have the same requirement in that both must have, at minimum, a Bachelor's Degree in Social Work, Psychology, Marriage and Family Counseling, or a closely related field. The difference in the two titles is that for Professional staff, they must additionally possess a minimum of one year of experience providing direct client services similar to the services listed in this SOW. See below:

9.2.2 Paraprofessional Staff: Paraprofessional staff shall have, at minimum, a Bachelor's Degree in Social Work, Psychology, Marriage and Family Counseling, or a closely related field. CONTRACTOR shall ensure that all paraprofessional staff possesses the expertise and experience necessary to provide direct client services as required in this SOW.

9.2.3 Professional Staff: Professional staff shall have, at minimum, a Bachelor's Degree in Social Work, Psychology, Marriage and Family Counseling or a closely related field, and have a minimum of one year of experience providing direct client services similar to the services listed in this SOW.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

28. Exhibit A-10 could be a HIPPA violation including clients' phone # - if a neighbor gets it or client has moved.

Response: We will omit the phone and address lines from Exhibit A-10 to ensure confidentiality.

29. Exhibit A-11 – confusing - are we expected to send fax the 1st time we attempt to contact client? Are all forms also in Spanish? If so, they should be included in contract packet.

Response: Exhibit A-11 is the Initial Attempted Contact Form which is addressed in SOW section 6.1.6. This section indicates that the agency is to fax the A-11 to inform the CSW that a first visit to the family's home was attempted.

In addition, Spanish Attempted Contact forms will be provided.

30. Re: Fee-for-service. Consider following Federal Grant disbursement system - where agencies can "draw" down versus waiting for a long time for reimbursement (causing layoffs). This could be on a monthly or quarterly basis with oversight, and an agency could be required to pay back immediately if funds are not used appropriately. This would eliminate significant fiscal challenges facing agencies.

Response: The County does not provide an option to pay their Contractors prior to services being provided.

31. There should be broader mention of "Dating Violence" Programs for Teens/YA within services focused on Domestic Violence/Anger Management. Dating Violence has specific, tailored resources and paradigms that are different from Domestic Violence model for adults. Adding this will expand the benefit and long-term impact from those services, and acknowledge agencies doing this comprehensive work!

Response: CONTRACTORS have the ability to tailor their services to address specific populations in their community and may bill for these services under the supplemental categories provided. CONTRACTORS are also encouraged to subcontract with community agencies that provide a specialized service within the CONTRACTOR'S particular community/neighborhood.

32. For Up-Front Assessments (UFA'S) all resources and referrals for the client are given and addressed while in the home immediately following the UFA. We are not contracted to continue to provide follow-up contacts post UFA. What is the requirement on pg. 12 (section 6.2.5)?

Response: Section 6.2.5 refers to the timeline the assessor has to make contact with the family and the procedures to follow if contact was not successful. This section states that, for ERCP cases, after the initial assessment, optional stabilizing services, 3 hours of T&D and 3 hours of IHOC services can be provided.

33. Need some clarification with regards to medically fragile.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

Response: We define Medically Fragile as Children with special health care needs as defined by Assembly Bill 2268. These children have medical conditions and symptoms that require special procedures, may be temporarily or permanently dependent upon medical equipment and/or devices, therapies and may require ongoing medical care and assessment as determined by the child's physician. The caregiver must have been trained to provide the specialized in-home health care to these children. This language will be amended in Attachment O - Definitions section.

34. Exhibit A-13 #4-ILP for foster care not FP clients

Response: We will modify Exhibit A-13 to clarify #4 referencing ILP clients.

35. Ability to coordinate date of accepting referrals.

Response: Referrals are assigned by the CBLs based on the weekly case count provided by the agencies every Monday. On the Weekly Case Count document, agencies provide the number of openings they have. In addition, each Program Manager or assigned agency staff can contact the designated CBL for each office serviced by their assigned contract and coordinate case assignment. Agencies also may utilize the Task Force Meetings (section 8.2.9) to discuss DCFS regional office protocols regarding coordination of referral start dates.

36. (Pg. 39) Please give more time for training if part-time staff

Response: We understand the difficulty for agencies to provide training to staff who does not work full time. There are plans to amend the SOW to reflect the requirements that CONTRACTORS provide 40 hours of training for part time staff for a period not to exceed 3 months. This will be reflected in the SOW.

37. Can the initial 40 hour training within 30 days be extended to 45 days? This is difficult during months with holidays (e.g., Nov., Dec.)

Response: There are plans to amend the SOW to require 40 hours of training in the first 45 days for full time staff.

38. (Section 7.2.9) Define evening hours.

Response: Evening hours as referenced in Section 7.2.9 (IFP services) refers to the hours outside the normal business hours of 8am to 5pm Monday through Friday. Due to the number of visits needed for Intensive Family Preservation services, Contractors shall be available outside of normal business hours. The language in the SOW will be amended to reflect this policy.

39. RFP addressed two additional visits in the evening (supplemental?) This should be flexible according to the families need.

Response: There are plans to amend the SOW language to allow for that flexibility.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

40. Splitting out “FP Assessment Services” (section 6.0) from FP Intervention Services (section 7.0) makes no sense. These processes are a continuum under case management.

Response: FP Assessment Services were designed specifically to identify issues of mental health, domestic violence and substance abuse, and provide a clinical assessment prior to the Department making decisions regarding the needs of the family.

Whereas, FP Intervention Services are broader and have a different assessment component more focused on the family strengths and underlying needs and provide services to strengthen the family unit to prevent the removal of children and/or facilitate the return of children to their home.

We agree that the services are a part of a continuum of care. These specific services do fall under the Family Preservation umbrella. However, the requirements for each component differ and are therefore outlined separately.

41. Making the proposals repeat the same language for FP Intervention vs. FP ARS is silo thinking and fragments the FP program unnecessarily.

Response: The SOW was written in this format to ensure that the CONTRACTORS are clear on the requirements to each service category.

42. We recommend that DCFS enumerate the need for reducing family rejection of LGBTQ children and youth as part of the target population in the Family Preservation Services statement of work released with the upcoming RFP.

Response: We recognize that the LGBTQ population has unique needs. Although LGBTQ is not listed as a specific target population, the SOW language does state that any population can be served through Family Preservation. CONTRACTORS may provide direct services, services through linkages or subcontract with a community agency with specialized services.

43. Need for FP and family acceptance services for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning (LGBTQ) youth.

Response: Refer to #42.

44. We recommend that DCFS consider a designated countywide Family Preservation Services contract to meet the underlying unique and individual needs of LGBTQ children and youth who are at risk of child abuse and neglect for family acceptance and support of their whole identities, including gender expression, gender identity and sexual orientation.

Response: We recognize the specific needs of the LGBTQ population, however, will not be seeking a countywide Family Preservation Services contract at this time. As stated in #43, Contractors have many options in addressing the specific needs of this population.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

45. Case notes why not on the weekly note add section?

Response: This question is unclear.

CONTRACTS

1. 40% of RFP weighted on site visits – result: influx of faith-based and African American community-based agencies. Point values applied are inconsistent. Referring to back in 2005 or when the last RFP was released, site-visits were conducted and scored. Argument is that site-visits should be valued and scored because that is important.

Response: Our records indicate that site visits were not scored during the 2005 solicitation. In the last RFP release for Family Preservation, we received 117 proposals. Due to the magnitude of proposals received for this RFP, site visits would be a challenge to complete because of the strict timeline and coordination of schedule for evaluators. We also need to be cautious with Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 92.36.(12)(c)(2)

“Grantees and subgrantees will conduct procurements in a manner that prohibits the use of statutorily or administratively imposed in-State or local geographical preferences in the evaluation of bids or proposals, except in those cases where applicable Federal statutes expressly mandate or encourage geographical preference.”

These regulations are indicated under the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance for Promoting Safe and Stable Families under the Credential/Documentation Section.

2. Small, minority & women owned firms award to these & reflect in RFP. What steps are being taken to meet this goal? CDSS requirements re: procurement process. County must follow National policy.

Response: The County allows for a preference program under the Local Small Business Enterprise to procure services from small, minority & women owned firms.

The County will give Local SBE preference during the solicitation process to businesses that meet the definition of a Local Small Business Enterprise (Local SBE), consistent with Chapter 2.204.030C.1 of the Los Angeles County Code. A Local SBE is defined as: 1) A business certified by the State of California as a small business and 2) has had its principal office located in Los Angeles County for at least one year. The business must be certified by Internal Services Department as meeting the requirements set forth in 1 and 2 above prior to requesting the Local SBE Preference in a solicitation.

To apply for certification as a Local SBE, businesses may register with Internal Services Department at <http://laosb.org>

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

Certified Local SBEs must request the SBE Preference in their solicitation responses and may not request the preference unless the certification process has been completed and certification affirmed. Businesses must attach the Local SBE Certification Letter to the Required Form - Request for Local SBE Preference Program Consideration and CBE Firm/Organization Information Form - Required Forms with their proposal. Sanctions and financial penalties may apply to a business that knowingly, and with intent to defraud, seeks to obtain or maintain certification as a certified Local SBE.

Information about the State's small business enterprise certification regulations is in the California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Subchapter 8, Section 1896 et seq., and is also available on the California Department of General Services Office of Small Business Certification and Resources Web site at <http://www.pd.dgs.ca.gov/smbus/default>.

3. Regional offices excluded from this process. They should be included to reflect true account of what families are being served and services provided. They should be included to verify performance.
Response: Regional offices could participate in the process; however, they will not be evaluating proposals submitted for their service area. The Department needs to avoid the appearance of being biased.
4. Departments Priority: Child safety/well-being; 300 points awarded for disproportionality or number of points about prep for labor action. Inequity in point value.
Response: The evaluation tool will be revised along with the Statement of Work.
5. Core Practice Model (CPM) refers to SOW only specific questions, protective factors framework, CPM. Wraparound proposal process recommended so it matches evaluation tool.
Response: The evaluation tool will be revised along with the Statement of Work and will take into consideration CPM and Protective Factors Framework.
6. Positive: Strategic Plan works; brought people together.
Response: Suggestion will be considered.
7. Only MOU's should be attached beyond page limits.
Response: Suggestion will be considered.
8. Protective factors framework; CPM & disproportionality should be valued and scored.
Response: The evaluation tool will be revised along with the Statement of Work and will take into consideration CPM and disproportionality.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

9. Improvement: Background experience should be scored & it's not.
Response: . The evaluation tool will be revised to score background and experience.
10. Experience should be based on number of years; assessment, teaching/demonstrating not scored on last RFP.
Response: The evaluation tool will be revised for the upcoming RFP.
11. Eliminate long-term financial liability (disregards available resources) points lost.
Response: Financial capability allows the Department to have an understanding of the proposers' long term standing and whether or not the vendor is able to sustain and commit to a contract as indicated by their proposal.
12. Value for providing optional services. Points work against them. Those that did this gained points (agencies who entered into partnership) opportunity not given to all agencies to officially collaborate – had to split instead of multiply. No additional points awarded. **(More than 3 attendees feel this is important)**.
Response: Suggestion will be considered.
13. RFP is unworkable, 4 different programs; pricing formula affects those who serve more families as opposed to providing different services.
Response: The previous RFP was made up of five different program categories which provide different services to different target populations, thus there were different pricing structures for each program.
14. Include voice of ARA's CSW's, etc. – regional staff
Response: Regional offices could participate in the process; however, they will not be evaluating proposals submitted for their service area. The Department needs to avoid the appearance of being biased.
15. Pricing component 1) lowest bid awarded 2) allocations changed three times during RFP process (certain areas gained funding, certain areas lost funding); include supplemental services **(More than 3 attendees feel this is important)**
Response: The method used by DCFS and most other County departments is that of ratio analysis for the cost evaluation. This method allowed the Department to award points to all bids proportional to the lowest bid submitted in each area.
16. Scoring should be based on a clear understanding of the program, not how well you wrote it.
Response: Proposers need to demonstrate their understanding of the program and articulate their response in their proposal as it relates to the Statement of Work.
17. Should be based on outcomes & performance, not compliance.
Response: Suggestion will be considered.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

18. RFP 50k possible points – simplify scoring process, points assessed is too much.

Response: The total maximum points for the upcoming solicitation will be reduced.

19. Evaluation – County should release a clear understanding. What training will evaluators have?

Response: Each solicitation is customized to include a description of program services to ensure that the evaluators understand the program that is being procured. County Policy No. 5.054 indicates the following:

Each department shall comply with Evaluation Methodology Policy to ensure a consistent process for the evaluation of proposals. This applies to competitive solicitations (e.g., RFPs and RFSQs) where proposals are evaluated and scored by a panel based on several factors, such as qualifications, experience, work plan, and price.

The Informed Averaging method requires that evaluators independently review and score each proposal using the rating factors included in the individual evaluation worksheet. Evaluators then meet as a group to discuss, and following such discussion, then individually determine if they wish to change any scoring based on the discussion. The basis for any changes in an individual evaluator's score shall be documented in the individual evaluation worksheet. All individual evaluators' scores shall be compiled in a final evaluation worksheet and are averaged to complete the evaluation process. All evaluator written notes must be included on the individual evaluation worksheets and/or the final evaluation worksheet.

20. Evaluators need to understand what makes up the program.

Response: A program presentation will be held at the evaluator training.

21. How will evaluations be shared as part of the process?

Response: Please refer to question 22 response (below) for guidelines on how to obtain evaluations as part of the protest process.

22. Appeals process needs to be outlined (County Review Panel). Is there a process where the decision is enforced? Is there a policy that allows for appeals with the State that is enforced?

Response: The appeals process is always included as part of the solicitation document. The first step in the appeals process is the Departmental Debriefing followed by the Proposed Contractor Selection Review and ultimately ending with the County Independent Review. The County currently does not have an appeals policy to involve a State entity in the appeals process. The State has not been previously involved in any of the DCFS appeals process for past solicitations.

There are three levels of protest instituted by the County policy as stated below:

Departmental Debriefing Process

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

Upon completion of the evaluation, the Department shall notify the remaining Proposers in writing that the Department is entering negotiations with another Proposer. Upon receipt of the letter, any non-selected Proposer may submit a written request for a Debriefing within the timeframe specified in the letter. A request for a Debriefing may, in the Department's sole discretion, be denied if the request is not received within the specified timeframe.

The purpose of the Debriefing is to compare the requesting Proposer's response to the solicitation document with the evaluation document. The requesting Proposer shall be debriefed only on its response. Because contract negotiations are not yet complete, responses from other Proposers shall not be discussed, although the Department may inform the requesting Proposer of its relative ranking.

During or following the Debriefing, the Department will instruct the requesting Proposer of the manner and timeframe in which the requesting Proposer must notify the Department of its intent to request a Proposed Contractor Selection Review, if the requesting Proposer is not satisfied with the results of the Debriefing.

Proposed Contractor Selection Review

Any Proposer that has timely submitted a notice of its intent to request a Proposed Contractor Selection Review as described in this Section may submit a written request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review, in the manner and timeframe as shall be specified by the Department.

A request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review may, in the Department's sole discretion, be denied if the request does not satisfy all of the following criteria:

1. The person or entity requesting a Proposed Contractor Selection Review is a Proposer;
2. The request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review is submitted timely (i.e., by the date and time specified by the Department);
3. The person or entity requesting a Proposed Contractor Selection Review asserts in appropriate detail with factual reasons one or more of the following grounds for review:
 - a. The Department materially failed to follow procedures specified in its solicitation document. This includes:
 - i. Failure to correctly apply the standards for reviewing the proposal format requirements.
 - i. Failure to correctly apply the standards, and/or follow the prescribed methods, for evaluating the proposals as specified in the solicitation document.
 - iii. Use of evaluation criteria that were different from the evaluation criteria disclosed in the solicitation document.
 - b. The Department made identifiable mathematical or other errors in evaluating proposals, resulting in the Proposer receiving an

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

incorrect score and not being selected as the recommended contractor.

- c. A member of the Evaluation Committee demonstrated bias in the conduct of the evaluation.
- d. Another basis for review as provided by state or federal law; and

4. The request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review sets forth sufficient detail to demonstrate that, but for the Department's alleged failure, the Proposer would have been the lowest cost, responsive and responsible bid or the highest-scored proposal, as the case may be.

Upon completing the Proposed Contractor Selection Review, the Department representative shall issue a written decision to the Proposer within a reasonable time following receipt of the request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review, and always before the date the contract award recommendation is to be heard by the Board. The written decision shall additionally instruct the Proposer of the manner and timeframe for requesting a County Independent Review.

County Independent Review Process

Any Proposer that is not satisfied with the results of the Proposed Contractor Selection Review may submit a written request for a County Independent Review in the manner and timeframe specified by the Department in the Department's written decision regarding the Proposed Contractor Selection Review.

23. Allow to submit electronically instead of so much paper. (More than 3 attendees feel this is important)

Response: Number of copies requested will be reduced from five to three copies for both the business and cost proposals. Submission will also include a PDF file of the proposal in a CD.

24. RFP and scoring instrument should reflect community input as a priority.

Response: Suggestion will be considered.

25. Scoring tool should be weighted consistent with our priorities.

Response: DCFS has to adhere to Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 74.43 Competition "...In order to ensure objective contractor performance and eliminate unfair competitive advantage, contractors that develop or draft grant applications, or contract specifications, requirements, statements of work, invitations for bids and/or request for proposals shall be excluded from competing for such procurements."

26. Review questions must align/match the RFP. The questions judges received did not always align with what agencies were told to provide via the RFP.

Response: The evaluation tool will be revised along with the Statement of Work.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

27. DCFS staff was often reluctant or unwilling to correct obvious mathematical scoring errors or missing scores.

Response: DCFS follows the County's protest policy as outlined in question number 23. During the previous solicitation all obvious math errors were corrected.

28. During the appeal/retraction of the previous RFP, were agency's proposals viewed or seen by other community agencies? Often times when an award is appealed/pulled a comparative process occurs in which agencies request info as to "how others scored/rated" – we are concerned this may have happened and various proprietary innovative approaches utilized in our winning RFP may have been exposed. There should be transparency by DCFS regarding notification to agencies if their RFP was viewed. What is the policy?

Response: DCFS included the language below in the previous RFP and it will be include it in the upcoming RFP regarding the release of recommended proposer's proposal.

Notice to Proposers Concerning the Public Records Act

Responses to this solicitation shall become the exclusive property of the County. Absent extraordinary circumstances, the recommended proposer's proposal will become a matter of public record when (1) contract negotiations are complete; (2) (Department) receives a letter from the recommended Proposer's authorized officer that the negotiated contract is the firm offer of the recommended Proposer; and (3) (Department) releases a copy of the recommended Proposer's proposal in response to a Notice of Intent to Request a Proposed Contractor Selection Review under Board Policy No. 5.055.

Notwithstanding the above, absent extraordinary circumstances, all proposals will become a matter of public record when the Department's proposer recommendation appears on the Board agenda.

Exceptions to disclosure are those parts or portions of all proposals that are justifiably defined as business or trade secrets, and plainly marked by the Proposer as "Trade Secret," "Confidential," or "Proprietary."

The County shall not, in any way, be liable or responsible for the disclosure of any such record or any parts thereof, if disclosure is required or permitted under the California Public Records Act or otherwise by law. A blanket statement of confidentiality or the marking of each page of the proposal as confidential shall not be deemed sufficient notice of exception. The Proposers must specifically label only those provisions of their respective proposal which are "Trade Secrets," "Confidential," or "Proprietary" in nature.

In the event the County is required to defend an action on a Public Records Act request for any of the aforementioned documents, information, books, records, and/or contents of a proposal marked "confidential," "trade secrets," or "proprietary," Proposer agrees to defend and indemnify County from all costs and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, incurred in connection with any action, proceedings, or liability arising in connection with the Public Records Act request.

29. Who will evaluate the RFP submissions?

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions – Family Preservation**

Response: Evaluators will be screened to ensure there is no bias and/or conflict of interest.

30. What training will the evaluators receive?

Response: Each solicitation is customized to include a description of program services to ensure that the evaluators understand the program that is being procured.

31. How will the evaluation instrument be changed compared with the last release of the RFP?

Response: The evaluation instrument will be changed for this upcoming RFP.

32. It is unwieldy to have 50,000 as the total possible number of points that can be scored. In addition, there are large gaps between the total numbers of points possible at each level (Exceeds, Meets, Does Not Meet). It would be better to have a scoring system without the gaps and for a lower, and more reasonable, possible number of points.

Response: The total maximum points for the upcoming solicitation will be reduced.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions - Partnership For Families**

PROGRAM

1. Remove “?” from PFF (Blue flowchart).
Response: It has been confirmed that the funding for the PFF Program and a public solicitation is forthcoming. The question mark on the SCSF Continuum Flowchart will be removed in future drafts.

2. Maximum Percentages - Will you iterate those? (percentage of use of contracts) – Addressed in SOW.
Response: Yes, the final SOW will have all percentages clearly stated.
Currently, the sections with specified percentages currently are (although these locations may change):

PAGE 7: CONTRACTOR shall utilize a maximum of forty-five percent (45%) of the total contract award for clients receiving Case Management Services, Health/Parenting Education and Structured Activities and Early Care and Education.

PAGE 10: A maximum of twenty percent (20%) of the total contract award shall be used to assist families with Concrete Support Services.

PAGE 11: CONTRACTOR shall allocate a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the total contract award for the direct provision of psychotherapy services. CONTRACTOR may request approval from COUNTY Program Manager to apply unused psychotherapy funds to other PFF service components.

PAGE 14: CONTRACTOR shall utilize a maximum of fifteen percent (15%) of the total contract award for Capacity Building. Fifty percent (50%) of the total Capacity Building shall be used for internal capacity building and fifty percent (50%) shall be used for external capacity building. Any projects with a total cost of more than \$5,000 will require CPM approval prior to expending these funds. Unused funds shall be utilized for the provision of direct services.

3. Goals regarding: Child Safety/Well Being... RFP Evaluation Process doesn't address priorities.
Response: The development of the evaluation tool will be a collaborative process and careful consideration will be given to prioritization and relevance of these issues.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions - Partnership For Families**

4. Record Keeping- Lots of duplication. Realignment and consideration for documentation requirements. FAF as part of recordkeeping. **(More than 3 attendees felt this is important)**.
Response: Usage of web-based tools which support data entry and record keeping will be considered. The goal will be to consolidate record keeping and reduce paper documents to the minimum required.
5. 0-5 and 0-18 Program. Priority given to 5 and under? First 5 Funds 0-5, LA County doesn't have this requirement. Crucial to use up to age 18.
Response: The PFF program will maintain a focus on the target population of zero to age 5 for DCFS referred clients. In addition, other service criteria being considered are:
 - Upon request of the CPM, PFF agencies will serve families who only have children ages 6 to 18.
 - PFF agencies will serve ARS transferred families when a determination has been made that the family's risk level is above the ARS service criteria. The ARS and PFF County Program Managers will work collaboratively to ensure the timely transfer.
 - For community clients: opening PFF eligibility to clients up to six months postpartum and additionally, with County Program Manager's (CPM) approval, up to one year postpartum.
 - For community clients: opening PFF eligibility to fathers prior to birth and up to six months postpartum and additionally, with County Program Manager's (CPM) approval, up to one year postpartum.
6. Focus on 0-5 because of limited funds **(More than 4 attendees felt this is important)**.
Response: Please see response #5.
7. Evidence-Based Practice/Services should be emphasized. Evidence-Base Clearing House.
Response: The utilization of Evidence Based Practices (EBP), when congruent with the needs of the target population, is considered the optimal direction for child welfare practice to move towards. While not required, EBP's may be employed whenever appropriate.
8. CPM/Strong Families. Bidders need to include how they do this.
Response: More information will be provided as a part of the solicitation, regarding core concepts and philosophies that will be expected to be included by prospective contractors.
9. Identify all sources of funding; State, Federal, City? Statutory requirements with Federal/State Laws. How do requirements relate?

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions - Partnership For Families**

Response: The likely possible sources of funding will be Title IV-E waiver or State Realignment funds.

10. Psychotherapy Services: Can we also bill for this out of 10% of budget? *Even if they have Medi-Cal?

Response: Medi-Cal eligible clients may not be billed against the PFF 10% funding requirement.

11. Expanding beyond 0-5-High Risk. Capacity Concern. Tripling Capacity. Can we meet the expanding need? **(More than 1 attendee felt this is important).**

Response: Please see response #5.

12. Amount of information required by DCFS. When no open case (especially pregnant women). People less willing to accept services if it means it will get back to DCFS.

Response: There is a baseline level of information needed to evaluate the program and to ensure that funds have been utilized in an appropriate manner. Various options regarding the reporting requirements for community clients, including utilizing a third party as holder of the confidential information shall be considered.

13. 0-5 Risk Factors; Concern is communication with Regional Offices.

13.1 Massive Closure of DCFS cases regardless of risk.

13.2 Level of risk shouldn't be a factor. We find other indicators that warrant high risk.

13.3 Continuum of age within family beyond 0-5, hoping flexibility to serve beyond 0-5 population.

Response: Please see response #5.

14. Prevention: Step back from intrusive process that turns families away "Intake", "Case" are examples of buzz words. Monitoring approach is a turn off. -How does this make families feel? **(More than 2 attendees felt this is important).**

Response: Terminology that is more strength based and more family friendly, such as "check-in" instead of "intake" and "collaboration" instead of "case" will be sought for consideration.

15. 0-5 postpartum depression is a key factor. To allow eligibility as new clients for County referrals beyond 6 months after childbirth **(more than 7 attendees felt this is important).**

Response: Please see response #5.

16. September 23, 2014, BOS letter regarding Title IV-E waiver addresses funding. Taking over for First 5 LA. Moving onto current providers?

16.1 Extending Agencies.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions - Partnership For Families**

Response: There will be a new public solicitation process.

17. Perks: Housing vouchers, linkages? Continue?

Response: A similar span of concrete support services as well as linkages are being considered, as to what exists under the current PFF Program. This includes setting a maximum of 20% of the total contract award for concrete support services which may include but not be limited to food, adequate housing, transportation, clothing, and medical care, as identified in the family's needs assessment. PFF Families can receive up to two months of housing assistance and, with approval from CPM, can receive extended housing assistance. Linkage services will be provided when the PFF agency is unable to provide services to meet a family's assessed needs.

18. Billing: Consider Cost Reimbursement or Fee for Service? Which one? Realistic Reimbursement. (**More than 3 attendees felt Cost Reimbursement is important**).

Response: The appropriate contract model to be employed for PFF is being researched. Currently, the plan is to maintain the use of a Cost Reimbursement model.

19. Expanding target population to include fathers and teens, with 0-5 children. Young maternal age (24 and under?), same for fathers, include them for services.

Response: Please see response #5.

20. Reference flow chart: FP contract scattered. Should FP be combined with PFF- instead of separating out; simplifying? Referring to ARS portion.

Response: These are two distinct populations which will be better served through the two separate programs.

21. 0-5 Focus (**more than 4 attendees felt this is important**).

Response: Please see response #5.

22. Zip codes: will this continue or SPA-wide?

Response: PFF services are county-wide and SPA based.

23. Confirmed funding for PFF as of today? Yes.

Response: Funding is confirmed for the PFF Program. The most likely sources of funding for PFF will be Title IV-E waiver or State Realignment funds.

24. Two county wide initiatives; will they still be included?

Response: Yes, the plan is to have two all-county contracts, one each for American Indian/Native American and Asian Pacific Islanders.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions - Partnership For Families**

25. Evaluation:

- a. DCFS involvement appears to be the only outcome indicator.
- b. Reduces quality to something superficial.

26.3 Program reporting:

26.3.1. Quarterly based on projections.

26.3.2 Mid-year.

26.3.3 Year-end.

26.4 Based on service delivery (e.g.: 40 Quarterly; Mid-year-more detailed provided; success stories; snapshot throughout)

26.5 Persimmony. Can we use this system?

Response: The overall intention is to look at child welfare indicators as well as build in the Strengthening Families foundation and the Protective Factors in order to evaluate the program and determine success. Upon consultation with First 5 LA there will be further consideration of streamlining the reporting requirements for the PFF Program.

26. Prevention goals are not defined-use well-defined instruments that exist.

Response: The overall intention is to look at child welfare indicators as well as build in the Strengthening Families foundation and the Protective Factors in order to evaluate the program and determine success. The FAF is being considered for use as another means by which family functioning and outcomes will be assessed.

27. Action when a new contract does not open within 30 days; does not begin providing services, especially when it's for cost reimbursement.

Response: This is a contract deliverable, to which all contractors will be held accountable.

28. Evaluation: Possible 3rd party involved so information is share between DCFS (recidivism, protective factors).

Response: Various options regarding the reporting requirements for the community clients are being considered. Contract monitoring protocols are being developed with the intent of maintaining community client confidentiality as appropriate.

29. Extend access to community referrals for in-home work from pregnant mothers who are at risk, (4 criteria) to mothers that meet criteria on year postpartum.

Response: Please see response #5.

30. Please consider sufficient training dollars for Evidence Base approaches or topics addressing families with children 0-5 in order to improve staff development.

Response: Please see response #7.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions - Partnership For Families**

31. Given the small amount of funds, why don't we use them to focus on high risk families with children 0-5 in order to get the most effective outcomes?

Response: Please see response #5.

32. Can we use our own EHR system versus forms provided?

Response: County developed forms will be utilized with the PFF Program. Any alternate options will be considered on a case by case basis.

33. Where are the waiver dollars that are supposed to be added to LGBTQ's?

Response: This is being looked into and expect a response will be forthcoming.

CONTRACTS

1. First process asked very few questions; just referred to SOW. – Ensures against guessing game.

The RFP should provide clear and specific questions that will guide the evaluators. Those questions should be linked to the questions asked on the evaluation documents used by the evaluation panel. This ensures that we are not playing a guessing game and that DCFS obtains the information necessary about our agencies and process in providing the services.

Response: Each question in the evaluation tool indicates where in the Request for Proposals document that specific question refers to.

2. Budget section of RFP. Evaluation Tool. Priorities: CPM/Strengthening Families - focus on important thing.

2.1 Each only worth 500 PTS.

2.2 Referral process worth 1,500 PTS.

2.3 Scoring is way off, doesn't make sense.

2.4 Use of Electronic forms not paper. **(More than 2 attendees felt this is important).**

Response: Suggestions will be considered

3. Training for reviewers (Conflict of interest with those overseeing the panel). **(More than 1 attendee felt this is important).**

Response: Each solicitation is customized to include a description of program services to ensure that the evaluators understand the program that is being procured. All persons assisting with the evaluation process will sign conflict of interest forms and a confidentiality agreement.

4. Questions need to be related to scoring. **(More than 1 attendee felt this is important).**

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions - Partnership For Families**

Response: The evaluation tool will be revised to reflect changes if any in the Statement of Work.

5. Experience? Subjective review process. **(More than 4 attendees felt this is important).**

Response: DCFS follows the informed averaging evaluation method as adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

6. Cost-reimbursement; not ½ something else.

Response: All County contracts are firm fixed price. Invoicing is done either in a cost reimbursement or fee for service approach. PFF invoicing is expected to be done on a cost reimbursement basis.

7. Timeline for RFP –

Response: The time line was addressed during the conference. The RFP will tentatively be released in a few months.

8. Electronic of RFP submission. **(More than 2 attendees felt this is important).**

Response: Number of copies requested will be reduced from five to three copies for both the business and cost proposals. Submission will also include a PDF file of the proposal in a CD.

9. One or two copies + CD and/or PDF, USB Drive. **(More than 3 attendees felt this is important).**

Response: Number of copies requested will be reduced from five to three copies for both the business and cost proposals. Submission will also include a PDF file of the proposal in a CD.

10. Please consider keeping a Cost-reimbursement contract instead of Fee-for Service.

Response: PFF invoicing is expected to be done on a cost reimbursement basis.

11. The RFP and evaluation process need to have consistency throughout with the stated goals of child safety and well-being, as well as responsible stewardship of public funds.

Response: The evaluation tool will be revised along with the Statement of Work to reflect the Department's priorities. The Department is always concerned with the stewardship of public funds.

12. The RFP should guide the proposers to provide the Information County needs in order to properly evaluate proposals by asking specific questions that link to the evaluation materials, rather than simply directing them to the Statement of Work.

**Safe Children and Strong Families (SCSF) Services
Public/Stakeholders' Conference
February 19, 2015
Comments & Questions - Partnership For Families**

Response: The evaluation tool will be revised. The RFP will provide guidelines on how to submit proposals and includes the evaluation criteria. Each proposer has the discretion to submit their proposal accordingly.

13. Although we cannot make comments about RFP, there were issues in the budget development- section that allowed us to win our appeal.
County ought to clarify the budget section.

Response: The evaluation tool for both the business and cost proposal will be revised along with the Statement of Work to reflect the Department's priorities.

14. I would hope scoring RFP would be altered to reflect stated priorities.

Response: The evaluation tool will be revised along with the Statement of Work to reflect the Department's priorities.

15. In previous evaluations tool Disproportionality, Strengthening Families and CPM was weighted less than how we were going to refer out.

Response: The evaluation tool will be revised along with the Statement of Work to reflect the Department's priorities.