

Answers to Reviewers' Questions

1. For Outcome Measure #1 of the scoring sheet, it indicates that the standard should exceed the prevalence of the target groups in the county - see table 2. I am confused on what table the scoring sheet is referring to, since the reference book that came with the RFPs does not number its tables.

Table two is included as item 4 in the handbook that we provided. Here is a copy of that table, the minimum standards are for each of the target groups:

Table 2. County Level Data – 2008 Estimates

County	Population 60+	60+ In Poverty	Low Income Minority <125% of Poverty Level	60+ With Mobility & Self Care Limitation	60+ Living in Rural Areas
Miami-Dade	462,236	17.8%	28.0%	8.2%	0.5%
Monroe	19,719	9.2%	19.3%	3.6%	10.0%
PSA-11	481,955	17.5%	28.0%	8.0%	1.0%

2. In section 3.B.1, the applicant mentioned a list of all the funding sources but did not state if it was \$1000 or more. Do I give them a score of 0 because they didn't if the dollar amount was \$1000 or more?? Or give them a 2 because they mentioned all their funding sources??

3.B.1. Provider Resources. Applicant identified other sources of funding or resources used to supplement the funding under this RFP.
 If one or more other sources of funding of \$1,000 or more are identified, the score is 2. If no other sources of funding of \$1,000 or more are identified, the score is 0. Enter score (0-2).

According to the directions, If one or more other sources of funding of \$1,000 or more are identified, the score is 2. If no other sources of funding of \$1,000 or more are identified, the score is 0. If you are satisfied that the sources of funding in excess of \$1,000 were identified, score as 2 points, if not score as 0 points.

3. In section Subtitle III-C1 section 3.C, What does it mean when it says "Literature Review?" Were they supposed to include Literature to be reviewed?? I would like some clarity regarding this as soon as possible. Thanks.

<p>3.C. New approaches/models of service delivery. The applicant demonstrated an ability to find new approaches or models for service delivery.</p> <p>Check boxes if applicant satisfactorily described new approach(es) based on</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Experience <input type="checkbox"/> Literature Review</p> <p>Enter the number of checked boxes and multiply by 2. This is the score. (0-4)</p>
--

Due to the space constraint that the Alliance placed on the applicants, the applicants might have performed a literature review but did not attach articles or provide quotations. Also, citation standards should not rise to the standard required of peer-reviewed journals. However, these applicants might, for example, allude to discoveries made in their literature review, cite methods by name or acronym, or reference some articles.

If you are satisfied that the applicant based their new approaches through a literature review, then check the box. If you are not satisfied that the applicant based their new approaches through a literature review, then do not check the box.

4. I have come across RFPs that report there are attachments (such as the required training plans), but no attachments are in the packet. Do we need to request this information separately? Other RFPs have the information within the RFP.

The applicants submitted an original and six copies of the application. You have received one of the copies. All efforts have been made to distribute complete materials to the reviewers. However, if any attachments appear to be missing in your copy, the Alliance for Aging will search for these items through the original submission from the applicants. If the referred attachments are included in the original, they will be delivered or emailed to the reviewers as quickly as possible. Please call James Tillery at 305-671-6317 to verify that the attachment was actually included with the original of the application, and if so arrange for delivery.