Comprehensive Professional Development Evaluation
RFP Questions

1. Will the slides from the Information Session be made available?

   Yes, a link to the PowerPoint presentation from the Information Session can be found on the RFP webpage http://www.first5la.org/Comprehensive-Professional-Development-Evaluation-RFP

2. How do we find the link to the online proposal submission system?

   The link to the online proposal submission system can be found on the RFP webpage (http://www.first5la.org/Comprehensive-Professional-Development-Evaluation-RFP) in the “How to Apply” section.

3. Will the application deadline be extended?

   No, First 5 LA does not anticipate extending the deadline beyond August 15, 2013.

4. Should the proposal describe our work for the planning period only, or for the entire period?

   The proposal should describe work for entire project period. It should not be limited to the planning period.

5. Also, should our budget be for the planning period or the entire project period?

   Applications should include two budgets: a) one for the entire project period and b) one for the seven month planning period only.

6. Is the subcontractor a line item in the deliverables-based budget template, or should the subcontractor also complete a separate Appendix I budget form? If the subcontractor should complete the budget form, should they also provide a separate budget narrative, or should they be included within the primary organization’s budget narrative?

   The subcontractor should not be a separate line item in the deliverables-based budget nor should the subcontractor complete a separate budget form. Instead, work to be completed by the subcontractor should be embedded in the overall project tasks through one or more designated staff categories, when applicable.

7. For sampling and recruitment, does First 5 LA have participant lists/records? Or, access to complete lists that can be provided to evaluators?

   Yes, the selected contractor will have access to participant lists.
8. Can you provide the list of information/variables available in the ECE Workforce Registry?

The list of variables available in the ECE Workforce Registry can be found in Appendices A and B, which can be accessed through a link on the RFP webpage: (http://www.first5la.org/Comprehensive-Professional-Development-Evaluation-RFP) in the “Important Documents” section.

9. Do you know how frequently the Registry information is updated for non-static variables such as hourly compensation?

FY 2012-13 is the first year that Registry data was collected for PD participants. All Registry members including PD participants will be prompted to update their employment information annually, but will have the ability to make changes anytime their employment circumstances change. Education (e.g., degrees and coursework) and qualifications (e.g., child development permits and teaching credentials held) will be updated annually as needed.

10. To what extent does the Registry include educators who have not participated in any of the professional development programs?

To date, there is minimal participation in the Registry by educators that have not participated in any of the professional development programs. However, the L.A. County Registry Office will be launched on August 1, 2013 and outreach and recruitment of individuals who have not participated in First 5 LA PD programs is a priority task for the Office. The Registry Office will be operated by the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles, which is the agency that represents the 10 Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies in L.A. County. Given their extensive network of over 10,000 providers throughout L.A. County, we expect Registry participation to increase significantly over the next year.

11. Is there a possibility for the evaluator to ask one or more PD programs to collect/maintain certain data necessary for the evaluation design?

There is the possibility of having one or more PD programs collect and/or maintain data necessary for the evaluation. The extent to which this will happen is dependent on a number of factors including weighing the potential value of the data with the cost and burden associated with its collection.

12. Are there other evaluations being completed (by First 5 LA or other entities) that might overlap with this one? How will you ensure that efforts are aligned or data collection efforts not duplicated?

Yes, there are other evaluations that have the potential to overlap with this one. For example, each contractor or grantee is conducting a project-level evaluation to inform their own program improvement. Another evaluation with the potential to overlap is one of the CARES Plus Program, which First 5 California is commissioning. First 5 LA
and the selected contractor will work together to develop a strategy or strategies to ensure awareness about other evaluation efforts, minimize duplication, and promote alignment and/or coordination.

13. Have you conducted similar work in the past?

Yes, First 5 LA has commissioned evaluations of our ECE professional development programs in the past. However, none of those studies were similar in size and/or scope to what is anticipated for the Comprehensive Professional Development Evaluation.

14. If you have conducted similar work to evaluate your ECE programs in the past, have you worked with an outside evaluator?

Yes, First 5 LA has worked with outside evaluators to evaluate our ECE professional development programs in the past. For example, we are currently working with researchers at the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment to evaluate the Child Development Workforce Initiative (CDWFI). Please note that the size and scope of that study is significantly different than what is expected for the Comprehensive Professional Development Evaluation.

15. You mentioned other publications and dissemination. Is it true that the contractor will be able to publish results at conferences and journal articles?

Absolutely, First 5 LA is making a significant investment in this evaluation and is interested in disseminating the findings widely.

16. Are there any specific policy tradeoffs that the commission is confronting?

The First 5 LA Commission has been engaged in ongoing discussions around issues of sustainability and the need for greater strategic focus. Data and information about existing investments are critical as the Commission makes decisions about how to maximize its impact through strategic investments. So while there are no specific policy trade-offs related to ECE Workforce Development at this time, it is possible that future Commission discussions will raise questions about which workforce objectives and related strategies will provide the greatest return on investment.

Questions 17-36 added on August 7, 2013

17. Is the deadline still August 15 even if answers aren’t available until 8/9?

Yes, First 5 LA does not anticipate extending the deadline beyond August 15, 2013.

18. Does the Commission intend to award a Fixed Price contract or a Time and Materials contract?
The contract for the Professional Development Evaluation will be a fixed price contract. At First 5 LA, we refer to this type of contract as Deliverables-Based. Deliverables are products of the activities specified in the Scope of Work. The task total in the budget will be broken down into a price per deliverable during the contract negotiation phase.

19. What are the details required for a “formal MOU” if there is subcontractor involvement on this project?

A formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) must reference the specific First 5 LA project it concerns, provide an overview of the agreement between the contractor and the subcontractor, and outline the activities the subcontractor agrees to perform should the contract be awarded to the primary applicant as well as the corresponding timeframe.

Given the deadline for applications in response to this RFP, a letter of commitment from the potential subcontractor that identifies the tasks they will perform consistent with the scope of work and budget narrative is acceptable in lieu of a formal MOU. A formal MOU will be required prior to contract execution.

20. If there are changes to the contract (Appendix E), is it encouraged to submit proposed changes to the contract at the time of application submission or will there be contract negotiations prior to a fully executed contract if awarded?

We encourage, but do not require applicants to submit proposed/requested changes to the contract terms and conditions at the time of application. Contract negotiations will take place prior to fully executing a contract, but any extensive contract negotiations will delay the start of the contract. If we receive proposed changes prior to the contract negotiation period, we can begin to assess how to address them.

21. Is the budget constrained to a composite hourly rate maximum of $150/hr inclusive of overhead/F&A?

Yes, the maximum composite rate is $150/hour. The composite rate is determined based on all costs associated with the contract including labor, overhead or indirect costs, direct costs, etc.

22. Can overhead/F&A be charged as a separate budget line item?

Overhead/indirect costs should be factored into hourly rates and should not appear as a separate line item in the budget.

Answers to questions 23-24 revised on August 8, 2013

23. Is there a cap on overhead/F&A charges?
Overhead/indirect costs should be limited to 10% of personnel costs excluding fringe benefits.

24. Is there a specific basis on which the overhead is to be calculated?

Overhead/indirect costs should be 10% of personnel costs excluding fringe benefits.

25. What types of incentives are allowable for participation by comparison group members?

First 5 LA does not have a policy that identifies allowable incentives. For this study, we expect that appropriate incentives will be provided to professional development participants as well as comparison group members. To the extent that applicants intend to offer incentives, they will need to make a determination regarding what is appropriate.

26. Is the expectation that the evaluation would also include evaluation of PD implementation?

First 5 LA does not require that the evaluation address quality or fidelity of implementation of the professional development programs. However, as indicated in the RFP, we do expect proposals to address questions in addition to those specified on pages 20 and 21 and welcome proposals that include a focus on implementation.

27. We understand that for this RFP, child data will not be collected - only data on PD program participants (e.g., early educators, university students interested in studying early childhood education). Is this correct?

We do not expect for child level data to be collected as part of the Comprehensive Professional Development Evaluation.

28. There is a section of the “outcomes of interest” section that refers to “child development and strategies to support it”. Does this refer to how well teachers attend to child development (e.g., that might be measured with a classroom quality instrument) rather than measured child outcomes?

The wording in the section you may be referring to states “We are also interested in knowledge about child development and strategies to support it.” In the RFP, we express our interest in early educators’ knowledge about child development and the strategies that support it. That said, we are also interested in how well teachers attend to child development and expect that “observations will be conducted to measure quality.” We do not expect for child outcomes to be measured.

29. The RFP says that the CDWFI program serves high school, community college, university students, and early educators. But the list of data variables provided in Appendix B mentions participants in only these groups: “Indicates if the participant is
in: (a) high school, (b) community college, (c) 4-year college or (c) graduate school.” Does this mean that all participants in this program are students of some description, but may also be early educators in addition to being a student? Please clarify who are the participants.

Yes, all participants in this program are students. They can be students in participating high schools, community colleges, or universities. Some participants are also early educators. Those individuals are students as well as working professionals. In FY 12-13, approximately 1/3 of CDWFI members were working in the ECE field.

30. Are the programs that serve individuals “open enrollment” (in contrast to organizational enrollment)? That is, might there be child care programs that have only one teacher enrolled in one of the PD programs while others might have all or most teachers enrolled?

Yes, the programs are “open enrollment.” None of the programs require that all or most teachers be enrolled. For most early educators, they are the only staff member from their site who is participating in one of the PD programs.

Two programs with unique circumstances are Steps to Excellence (STEP) and Early Childhood Education Professional Learning Communities (ECEPLC). In the case of STEP, entire child care programs, whether centers or family child care homes participate in STEP and are assigned a quality rating. However, there could be only one teacher who receives professional development support provided by STEP. In the case of ECEPLC, an elementary school site is enrolled in the ECEPLC program. However, it is only the Principal and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) teacher who participate in the training. The TK teacher at each school site also receives technical assistance and participates in the professional learning community.

31. Will the QRIS ratings of individual teachers be made available to the contractor?

STEP is the only program that assigns QRIS ratings to programs. STEP does not, however, assign ratings to individual teachers so there are no teacher ratings to make available to the contractor.

32. Are trend comparison analyses expected for most of the programs considered for evaluation?

First 5 LA expects the Comprehensive Professional Development Evaluation to include analysis comparing participants and non-participants over time.

33. Are there any estimates of typical early childhood staff turnover rates in the area?
No current data on early educator turnover rates in L.A. County is available. The most recent estimates are from a 2006 study conducted by researchers at the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment at the University of California at Berkeley and the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network. That study found that in L.A. County “annual ECE teacher turnover (23%) is twice that of California public school K-12 teachers (11%) (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005). ECE assistant teacher turnover is at 24%, and director turnover 16%, per year (Whitebook et. al, 2006).”

34. Are there any policy changes occurring that would affect the stability of the available workforce?

We are not aware of any policy changes occurring that would affect the stability of the workforce.

35. If an applicant has already submitted Signature Authorization and Agency Involvement in Litigation forms to First 5 LA, do they need to be submitted again?

New forms must be submitted with each application.

36. Will you be posting a list of organizations that attended the RFP webinar on July 19th?

We have compiled a list of Information Session attendees that have agreed to have their names and contact information shared. The list will be made available to potential applicants upon request.

Questions 37-42 added on August 9, 2013

37. Do any of the other program evaluations that are referred to in the RFP evaluate the quality and consistency of implementation of PD?

Nearly all of the program-level evaluations include a focus on implementation. However, there is great variability in terms of the aspects of implementation that are examined.

38. Do you have an estimate of the number of prior participants in all ECE programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of Prior Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASPIRE</td>
<td>1,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDWFI</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEPLC</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vistas</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. Are the programs that serve individuals on a “rolling enrollment” basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Rolling Enrollment</th>
<th>Designated Enrollment Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASPIRE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Applications due end of June; Enrollment through September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDWFI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>While enrollment is on a rolling basis beginning August 1 each year, it closes April 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEPLC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Schools must enroll prior to the start of the school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vistas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Is there a wait list of applicants for any of the six PD programs? If so, which ones, and is that expected to be the case for the next several years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Waitlist Currently?</th>
<th>Waitlist through June 2016?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASPIRE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Participants must start in the program by September of each year. Recruitment begins in the Spring and continues until Sept to fill all spots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDWFI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEPLC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Only one R&amp;R has a waiting list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>STEP will not be enrolling any new programs in the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vistas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. How participants are recruited from communities within Los Angeles County is unclear. Will this information be provided to bidders? Is this information available in First 5 LA literature for all programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approach to Recruitment</th>
<th>Geographically targeted outreach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ASPIRE    | • Outreach through local networks (e.g., R&R agencies, LAUP network, LACOE Head Start, colleges, etc.)  
          | • Mail recruitment materials to licensed programs in certain zip codes                  | • Zip codes with elementary schools with Academic Performance Index (API) rankings of 0-5  
          |                                                        | • Areas with low child care availability                                            |
| CDWFI     | • Information sessions in Child Development classes at participating community colleges  
          | • Flyers disseminated on community college campuses                                       | No                                                |
| ECEPLC    | • Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) bulletin and Interest Applications sent to Assistant Superintendents and Directors of Curriculum & Instruction Services at the 80 school districts in L.A. County  
          | • Information shared at existing LACOE meetings                                         | No                                                |
| Gateways  | • Coaching participants are recruited through training workshops and other programs at the R&R agencies | Not necessarily, although each R&R agency has a designated service area.             |
| STEP      | • Information sessions at R&R agencies  
          | • Information distributed at Child Care Planning Committee meetings  
          | • Mailings to all licensed providers in target communities  
          | • Follow up calls to providers who attended outreach sessions                         | • Yes  
          |                                                        | • During the pilot phase (2007-11) 11 communities were selected based on socioeconomic diversity, geographic distribution and child care service rates.  
          |                                                        | • In Fall 2012, seven new communities were added.                                    |
| Vistas    | • Outreach to community based agencies working with family child care providers, family child care associations, and R&R agencies. | • The pilot targeted L.A. County Supervisorial District 1; however, participants represented in each of the five supervisorial districts. |
42. Do you have a sense of how complete the Registry data is for PD participant data (e.g., most fields complete, many missing values, certain programs have better participant data than others)?

FY 2012-13 is the first year Registry data was collected for PD participants. Because the majority of the data was provided at the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 2013), we have not yet determined the extent of missing data for all Registry fields. We know that most “user profile” fields are complete for the nearly 3,000 participants with Registry data. We also know that there is limited employment data at this time.

The table below includes the number of participants in each program as well as the number of participants from each program that provided Registry data as of June 30, 2013. The expectation is that 95% of participants will provide Registry data each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 12-13 # of participants</th>
<th>FY 12-13 # of members with Registry data</th>
<th>Registry Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASPIRE</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDWFI</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEPLC</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Vistas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
- CDWFI numbers do not include high school participants.
- ECEPLC numbers do not include principals.
- STEP does not identify individuals as members.
- Project Vistas participants did not provide Registry data in FY 12-13, but will do so in FY 13-14.