



Sherrice Dorsey-Smith
Executive Director



Daniel Lurie
Mayor

STUDENT SUCCESS FUND EVALUATION RFP FINAL SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

This document contains all Questions and Answers submitted about DCYF’s Student Success Fund Evaluation RFP from April 27-May 10, 2026. The questions are being provided as they were submitted including any spelling errors or grammatical mistakes.

Use the following links to navigate the document by question topic:

BUDGET QUESTIONS	2
DATA & DELIVERABLES QUESTIONS	3
ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONS	9
GENERAL QUESTIONS	10
MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS QUESTIONS	15

BUDGET QUESTIONS

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
The budget file provided to proposers includes separate tabs for each fiscal year. Could DCYF confirm that each fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30?	Yes, each fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30.
Are additional Student Success Fund Evaluation activities permitted to be added to the budget template and/or can the budget template be modified?	Proposers may add additional evaluation activities to the budget template as needed to reflect their proposed evaluation approach.
Can DCYF provide additional guidance on the level of detail requested in the Budget Template, to ensure consistency and comparability across proposals. For example, is there guidance on the unit budgeted being a deliverable or labor category hours?	DCYF does not have additional required guidance beyond what is included in the Budget Template. Proposers should use their professional judgment to develop a budget that clearly reflects the proposed scope of work, staffing approach, and project activities. In general, DCYF expects budgets to be detailed enough to allow reviewers to understand how proposed costs relate to the work being proposed. Because evaluation approaches and organizational budgeting practices may vary, DCYF is not prescribing a single required unit structure. Proposers may use the approach that best aligns with their proposed methodology and internal budgeting practices, provided the budget is clear, reasonable, and sufficiently detailed for review. Please also note that if awarded, budgets will be negotiated based on the contract amount and scope of work.
How will the budget be scored? What criteria/rubric will be used?	The budget is worth 10 points out of the total of 100 points for each proposal. As stated in the RFP "proposal scorers will assess whether the budget is appropriate and reasonable for the proposed services."
Does DCYF want to see a budget narrative in addition to the template? If so, what information should be included?	Proposers should provide all information specified in the budget template. While the budget does not specifically request a narrative, each item within an SSF Eval Activity includes a description cell where narrative details can be provided.

DATA & DELIVERABLES QUESTIONS

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>What data is currently collected by DCYF throughout the year from grantees?</p>	<p>For the Student Success Fund, DCYF provides grants to school sites. Currently, DCYF collects data related to technical assistance participation and progress toward school site SMARTE goals.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What data will be available to measure school climate, family engagement, and sense of belonging? Are data collected and available to the contractor at the student level? 2. What data will be available to measure student outcomes? Are data collected and available to the contractor at the student level? 3. What data will be available to identify different groups of students? Are data collected and available to the contractor at the student level? 4. Are dosage data available for all of the SSF sites? Are data collected and available to the contractor at the student level? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SFUSD administers an annual survey of students, staff and family on school culture and climate. Data are available to measure school climate, family engagement, and sense of belonging. Data are available at the student level. 2. Various measures of student outcomes are available, ranging from academic (district and state assessments), attendance and behavior, and social-emotional learning (SEL) skills. Data are available at the student level. 3. SFUSD has students' race/ethnicity data at two levels of aggregation and students' "programs"—English Language Learner, socio-economic disadvantage, and special education. Data are available at the student level. 4. Practices and structures for the collection of dosage data are weak and inconsistent across sites and programs. The contractor(s) may need to help devise some practicable approach that can be implemented by sites and educators.
<p>Understanding what data might be provided to the research team from a single source — like DCYF or SFUSD — would clarify for bidders what field data collection they might need to conduct vs capitalizing on existing data collections and access. We have three questions related to this issue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What implementation data (types of implementation data) are available and would be provided to the research team? b. Can the research team assume that de-identified student-level education records will be provided by the district or the city? c. Are there any additional data collected by DCYF and SFUSD that will be provided to the research team to address the research questions? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. This question is deeply connected with the "dosage data" question above. SFUSD is continuing to build its knowledge and skills in collecting implementation data. Current practices are limited and isolated. The contractor(s) will likely work with SFUSD's internal research evaluation team to design and execute a workable data collection plan, given the severe resource constraints in the district. b. De-identified student-level data can be provided to the contractor(s) once the contractor(s) goes through the standards research application/review process with SFUSD's research team. The district data and research team can support any joining process that might be necessary with data coming from elsewhere (to the extent possible). c. Any additional data relevant to the evaluation that the district has can be shared with the contractor(s) if they are named during the research application process and are incorporated into the data use agreement.

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>To support evaluation planning and proposal development, please clarify what administrative data will be available to the selected contractor and at what level of disaggregation. Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Family engagement data: What family engagement data are currently collected by SFUSD, DCYF, or SSF grantees, and at what level are they available (e.g., school site, program, individual)? School climate data: Are school climate survey data — including student, staff, and/or family surveys — currently collected and available for evaluation purposes? If so, which instruments are used and how frequently are they administered? Program participation and attendance records: Are participation and attendance records maintained by DCYF, SFUSD, and CBO grantees in a standardized format, and will these be accessible to the contractor? Student-level administrative records: Will the contractor have access to student-level administrative records, including but not limited to academic achievement, attendance, chronic absence, behavior incidents, and special education status? If so, what data sharing agreements or approvals will be required? Technical assistance tracking data: Does DCYF or SFUSD or TA provider currently maintain a tracking system for TA participation — including coaching logs, PLC attendance, and Summit participation — and will these data be available to the contractor? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The district does not have direct data on family engagement. But some of the questions on the family culture/climate survey may indirectly speak to that. Annual school culture/climate survey is administered to students, staff and families. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family survey questions Student (Grades 4-5) survey questions Student (Grades 6-12) survey questions Yes, under the new and improved data sharing system, systematic records of students' participation in DCYF-affiliated CBO programs is available and would be accessible. Yes, student-level administrative data would be available to the contractor(s). The contractor(s) would undergo SFUSD research application process. Upon receiving the approval to conduct research/evaluation, the contractor(s) would also work out a data use agreement with the district. DCYF does maintain a tracking system for technical assistance administered by the department including in support of the Student Success Fund that includes attendance logs and session feedback. This data will be made available to the contractor(s) as needed.

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>Will the evaluation require review and approval by SFUSD's research office? If so, what is the anticipated timeline for that review, and should proposers account for this in their proposed project timelines?</p>	<p>Yes, the contractor(s) would complete the SFUSD research application process. Given the priority of the Student Success Fund work in SFUSD, the research request from the contractor(s) will be processed with appropriate urgency. If all the necessary materials are submitted properly, SFUSD's research department would be able to issue the approval within less than a month.</p> <p>Upon receiving the approval to conduct research/evaluation, the contractor(s) would also work out a data use agreement with the district. The timeline for this step usually depends on how much change in the agreement the contractor(s) wants to make.</p>
<p>Will separate data sharing agreements be required between each combination of parties — including the prime contractor, any evaluation subcontractors, SFUSD, and DCYF? If so, can DCYF provide a standard data sharing agreement template, and what is the anticipated timeline for executing these agreements?</p>	<p>Yes, the contractor(s) would complete the SFUSD research application process. Given the priority of the Student Success Fund work in SFUSD, the research request from the contractor(s) will be processed with appropriate urgency. If all the necessary materials are submitted properly, SFUSD's research department would be able to issue the approval within less than a month.</p> <p>Upon receiving the approval to conduct research/evaluation, the contractor(s) would also work out a data use agreement (DUA) with the district. The timeline for this step usually depends on how much change in the agreement the contractor(s) wants to make. Any evaluation subcontractor(s) would need a separate agreement, as the DUA does not permit parties to re-share data with others.</p>
<p>Will DCYF and SFUSD provide the contractor with contact information for relevant staff — including DCYF program staff, SFUSD central office staff, CBO leads, and Community School Coordinators — to support recruitment for primary data collection activities such as interviews, focus groups, and surveys?</p>	<p>Yes, the Student Success Fund team will support the contractor(s)' access to relevant staff and stakeholders.</p>

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>The evaluation deliverables listed in the RFP include, “Co-presentation of findings to multiple audiences across the District and City”. Can DCYF provide detail on how many presentations and specific audiences for the presentations. Will the presentations be in person?</p>	<p>DCYF cannot provide the exact number of presentations or audiences at this time. DCYF anticipates working collaboratively with the awarded contractor(s) during the contracting process to develop a scope of work and budget that reasonably anticipates the number and types of presentations that may occur over the course of the contract, including presentations to various District, City, and community stakeholders. While DCYF cannot confirm at this time whether all presentations will be conducted in person, proposers should reasonably anticipate that many presentations will likely be held in person.</p>
<p>The evaluation activities listed in the RFP include, “Conducting in-person research interviews with school site staff, partners, families, and system leaders”, Can DCYF provide the number of schools and the number of school site staff, partners, and families from each school that should be interviewed? The number of system leaders? Will school site staff be required to participate in interviews? Are school staff required to assist in identifying and scheduling the in-person interviews with staff, partners, and families? Can you give an example of system leaders and how many are required to be interviewed?</p>	<p>DCYF cannot provide the exact number of schools, school site staff, partners, families, or system leaders that the contractor(s) will be expected to interview at this time. DCYF anticipates working collaboratively with the awarded contractor(s) during the contracting process to develop a scope of work and budget that reasonably anticipates the number and types of interviews that may occur over the course of the contract. DCYF anticipates that school site staff participation and support with interview coordination may be an important component of the evaluation process. The Student Success Fund team will support the contractor(s) in identifying, coordinating, and scheduling interviews as appropriate. Examples of system leaders may include SFUSD central office staff, DCYF leadership, and school principals. DCYF cannot confirm at this time the exact number or types of system leaders that may be interviewed.</p>

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>DCYF cannot provide the exact number of meaning-making sessions the contractor will be expected to facilitate at this time, including the number of sessions per school site or the number of participating schools. DCYF anticipates working collaboratively with the awarded contractor(s) during the contracting process to develop a scope of work and budget that reasonably anticipates the number and types of meaning-making sessions that may occur over the course of the contract. Meaning-making sessions may include, but are not limited to review of evaluation findings, reports, and recommendations and could incorporate discussion, reflection, interpretation or planning activities related to various aspects of the Student Success Fund evaluation. While DCYF cannot confirm exactly how many sessions will be conducted in person, proposers should anticipate that the majority of meaning-making sessions will likely be held in person.</p>	<p>DCYF cannot provide the exact number of meaning-making sessions the contractor(s) will be expected to facilitate at this time, including the number of sessions per school site or the number of participating schools. DCYF anticipates working collaboratively with the awarded contractor(s) during the contracting process to develop a scope of work and budget that reasonably anticipates the number and types of meaning-making sessions that may occur over the course of the contract. Meaning-making sessions may include, but are not limited to, review of evaluation findings, reports, and recommendations and may also incorporate discussion, reflection, interpretation, or planning activities related to various aspects of the Student Success Fund evaluation. While DCYF cannot confirm exactly how many sessions will be conducted in person, proposers should anticipate that the majority of meaning-making sessions will likely be held in person.</p>
<p>Is the contractor required to survey students, parents, educators, and service providers at the school?</p>	<p>While DCYF has not yet determined whether the contractor(s) will be required to administer surveys as part of this evaluation, it is possible. One reason DCYF is not currently requiring contractor(s)-administered surveys is that other existing sources of data and stakeholder feedback may be available to leverage as part of the evaluation approach.</p>

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>The evaluation deliverables listed in the RFP include, “Annual evaluation reports and adaptations to meet needs and interests of SFUSD, City leaders in review and oversight, as well as transparency for San Francisco’s broader public stakeholders “. Is there an evaluation report sample/template that is required? Can DCYF provide more clarification about what “adaptations” on the evaluation report might entail? Will there be an opportunity to negotiate the work plan deliverables and/or activities if the “adaptations” require extensive additional work?</p>	<p>Adaptations in this context refer to different ways of presenting annual evaluation findings to meet the needs of various stakeholders, including SFUSD, City leadership, oversight bodies, and the broader public. While DCYF is not providing a required annual report template, proposers may refer to DCYF’s 2024–2025 Student Success Fund Annual Report as an example of a public-facing report format. Examples of potential adaptations could include presentations, executive summaries, briefing materials, or other formats tailored to different audiences. DCYF anticipates that the specific scope and nature of these deliverables will be refined collaboratively during the contracting process. DCYF is open to discussing and negotiating work plan deliverables and activities with the awarded contractor(s) and may allow contract budget modifications during the contract term if needed. DCYF will also work with the contractor(s) during budget development to anticipate potential adaptation needs in advance.</p>
<p>The evaluation activities listed in the RFP include, “Data collection from varied tiers of SF school communities to understand views of and engagement in SSF’s focused efforts to implement the Community Schools Model”. Can DCYF provide examples of the data collections and the tiers of SF school communities? By school communities, do you mean the schools that receive SSF grant funding? What is the number of school communities targeted for data collection?</p>	<p>The Student Success Fund is inclusive of multiple strategies that have different subsets of schools within each strategy.</p> <p>Example: Within the Community Schools Implementation Grant portfolio, there are 53 school communities - or individual schools targeted for data collection. These are divided by Elementary Schools without Beacon programs (21), Elementary and Middle Schools with Beacon Programs (22), and High Schools (10).</p>
<p>Will grantee progress reports be available to the contractor?</p>	<p>Yes, grantee progress reports submitted as part of ongoing quarterly invoicing processes, as well as annual reporting will be available to the contractor(s).</p>

ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONS

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>Can organizations that currently receive Student Success Fund (SSF) funding participate as subcontractors or subconsultants on an evaluation team, provided they are not serving as the prime grant recipient?</p>	<p>Yes, organizations currently receiving Student Success Fund funding through an SFUSD school site are eligible to participate as subcontractor(s) or subconsultants on an evaluation team. While DCYF provides SSF grant funding to schools, individual sites determine how those funds are used and which service providers receive them. DCYF does not directly award or manage those school site-level funding relationships. DCYF recognizes that potential conflicts of interest could arise if an organization that receives SSF funding from a particular school were involved in evaluating that same site. In the event DCYF awards a contract to a proposer utilizing such an organization as a subcontractor(s), DCYF would require the organization to recuse itself from evaluation activities, analysis, or findings related to the specific school site(s) from which it receives funding.</p>
<p>If SSF-funded organizations are permitted to participate as subcontractors, are there any restrictions on the types of activities they may perform (e.g., data collection, facilitation, community engagement, versus analysis or outcome evaluation)?</p>	<p>In the event DCYF awards a contract to a proposer utilizing an organization that receives SSF funds from a school site as a subcontractor(s), DCYF would require the organization to recuse itself from evaluation activities, analysis, or findings related to the specific school site(s) from which it receives funding.</p>
<p>Are organizations who are current student success fund grantees eligible to apply? If so, are there any restrictions related to cross staffing?</p>	<p>Yes, organizations currently receiving SSF funding through an SFUSD school site are eligible to apply to this RFP. While DCYF provides SSF grant funding to schools, individual school sites determine how those funds are used and which community-based organizations or service providers receive funding. DCYF does not directly award or manage those school site-level funding relationships. DCYF recognizes that potential conflicts of interest could arise if an organization receiving SSF funding from a particular school site were involved in evaluation activities related to that site. In such cases, DCYF would expect appropriate separation between program implementation staff and evaluation staff and may require recusal from evaluation activities, analysis, or findings related to the specific school site(s) from which the organization receives funding. DCYF does not currently have additional restrictions related to cross staffing beyond appropriate conflict-of-interest management and role separation where applicable.</p>

GENERAL QUESTIONS

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>If there are two contracts awarded, does the City expect that each contractor will do a portion of the evaluation, answering separate subsets of the research questions, or that there will be two concurrent full evaluations? And if two contracts are awarded, how might this affect resourcing for each contractor?</p>	<p>DCYF's intention is to contract with a single firm for the full scope of the evaluation. The "up to" language provides flexibility if the scope or budget changes. Therefore, proposers should submit budgets that address all aspects of the evaluation research questions, activities and deliverables.</p>
<p>Could DCYF confirm the expected contract type for this evaluation project (e.g., Fixed Price, Time and Materials (T&M))?</p>	<p>The contract type will be time and materials.</p>
<p>The RFP states that DCYF will order services through individual purchase orders and/or task orders. Could DCYF clarify whether the contract will cover a single, comprehensive scope of work, or be structured as a task-order-based contract (e.g., under an Indefinite Quantity, as-needed arrangement)?</p>	<p>The contract(s) will cover a single comprehensive scope of work.</p>
<p>The RFP indicates that DCYF expects to award up to two contracts and provides an annual allocation of up to \$600,000 (up to \$1.8M over three fiscal years). Could DCYF confirm whether this amount represents: a. The total maximum funding to be shared across all awarded contractors, or b. The maximum funding available per contract?</p>	<p>The annual allocation of up to \$600k is the maximum amount to be shared across all awarded contractors.</p>
<p>Can you please confirm the contracts intended to be awarded through this RFP: a. Page 3 references issuance of Purchase Orders and/or Task Orders against the awarded contract. Is this an RFP to be on a master contract for individual evaluation task orders? b. Page 3 and Page 11 that the City shall award up to 2 contracts. How would those contracts be divided?</p>	<p>a. This RFP is not intended to establish a master contract pool for separate evaluation task orders. DCYF anticipates awarding contract(s) for the Student Success Fund Evaluation scope described in this RFP. The references to Purchase Orders and Task Orders reflect standard City contract language and administrative processes related to contract implementation.</p> <p>b. DCYF's intention is to contract with a single firm for the full scope of the evaluation. The "up to" language provides flexibility if the scope or budget changes. In the event that DCYF did award 2 contracts the scope of work and budget would be determined based on the proposals received, the strengths and expertise of proposers, the amount awarded to each contract and contract negotiations.</p>

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
Should proposal-specific questions arise after the close of the question period — for example, regarding the budget template or required forms — will proposers be permitted to contact the Contract Administrator directly? If so, please provide the appropriate contact information and any limitations on post-period communication.	Eligible proposers needing technical assistance with budget templates or RFP forms may contact RFP@dcyf.org for assistance. Please note that DCYF will not respond to any content specific questions after the question submission deadline.
Can you please confirm that DCYF will conduct oral interviews for all firms that meet MQ and are invited to submit full qualifications, not just a set of finalists based on written proposal?	DCYF will conduct oral interviews with all eligible proposers that submit a written proposal and budget. Eligible proposers are firms that have met the Minimum Qualifications through the Intent to Apply process and have been given access to submit a written proposal and budget.
Could DCYF confirm the anticipated contract start date?	At the current time DCYF anticipates that the contract(s) resulting from this RFP will start on October 1st, 2026. Please note that this date could change depending on multiple factors including the speed of the scoping and contracting processes.
The Notice of Intent to Award is scheduled for August 24, 2026. If the fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30, could DCYF confirm whether the first fiscal year budget tab should reflect activities from the anticipated contract start date through June 30?	Yes, the first fiscal year budget should reflect the anticipated contract start date of October 1, 2026.
To what extent does DCYF encourage or value the inclusion of local community-based organizations with direct implementation experience in SFUSD schools as part of the evaluation team?	DCYF values the inclusion of diverse perspectives and experiences that can strengthen the quality, context, and interpretation of the evaluation. This may include organizations with direct experience implementing programs or services within SFUSD schools, particularly where that experience provides broader insight into youth services, school-based partnerships, systems coordination, or implementation approaches relevant to the Student Success Fund. DCYF encourages proposers to thoughtfully describe how the experiences and perspectives of team members would strengthen the overall evaluation approach.
How many new sites are funded for 26-27 school year and expected for 27-28 school year?	No new sites were funded for the 2026–2027 school year. At this time, DCYF does not anticipate funding additional school sites for the 2027–2028 school year.

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>How would DCYF like the contractor to determine attribution, given that many of the schools with SSF grants also have state or federal funding for similar activities? Is DCYF interested in understanding the unique contributions of SSF-funded activities, distinct from similar non-SSF-funded activities?</p>	<p>DCYF recognizes that many school sites receiving Student Success Fund grants also receive state, federal and other funding that may support similar or complementary activities. DCYF does not have a prescribed attribution methodology for this evaluation. However, because this evaluation is focused on the Student Success Fund, it is expected that the evaluation approach would focus on understanding the role, implementation and contributions of SSF strategies within the broader context of multiple funding streams and initiatives operating at school sites. DCYF is interested in understanding the contributions of Student Success Fund strategies while also recognizing that they occur within an environment that includes multiple funding sources. Proposers are encouraged to describe approaches they would use to assess SSF's contribution and added value within this multi-funding-source environment.</p>
<p>The draft contract vests all deliverables exclusively in the City and restricts the contractor from retaining or disseminating work products without prior written City authorization. Will DCYF consider a contract modification permitting the contractor to publish findings — including in peer-reviewed journals and public reports — subject to City review, approval, and any required confidentiality or data use protections?</p>	<p>Eligible proposers have the option to submit their proposed modifications to Attachment 1: P-600 (01-26) Contract Template as a part of the written proposal and budget form. If award DCYF will consider these modifications during the contracting process.</p>
<p>Is there an incumbent contractor for this RFP based on prior evaluation or technical assistance work with DCYF or SFUSD?</p>	<p>There is not an incumbent contractor for this RFP.</p>
<p>Does the proposal submission system support the inclusion of tables and figures within narrative responses? If so, are tables and figures included in the word count for each section, or are they excluded from word count calculations?</p>	<p>The RFP submission system is not designed to support complex formatting or embedded tables and figures within narrative response fields. Proposers should plan to provide narrative responses primarily as text entered directly into the designated response fields. While some formatting may be retained when content is pasted into the system, proposers should not rely on formatting being preserved. All text entered into a response field will count toward the word limit.</p>

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
Does a non-LBE Prime receive any LBE rating bonus points based on Small/Micro LBE subcontractor participation? If so, what is the applicable bonus percentage and minimum subcontracting threshold required to qualify for any points?	No, there is no LBE rating bonus for non-LBE proposers.
Will all payment to the contractor be delivered only on a reimbursement basis after services are delivered? Or will there be an option for an advance or some other billing up front prior to services being delivered? And will there be some negotiation of the fee structure for this contract between DCYF and the selected contractor?	All payment will be delivered on a reimbursement basis after services are delivered. DCYF will negotiate the budget with the awarded contractor(s) based on the final contract amount and scope of work.
Are there existing/concurrent evaluations for the other funding streams for Community Schools in SFUSD, referenced on page 2?	SFUSD is not conducting a concurrent program evaluation for Community Schools work related to work funded by the California Department of Education. However, there are 1) ongoing continuous improvement internal analysis happening for Lesson Study, which is a key component of SSF and 2) a long-term research project by a Stanford University research team qualitatively examining various aspects of Lesson Study.
On page 3, the last sentence in “Anticipated Contract Not to Exceed Amount” is incomplete. Can you please provide the full language?	Thank you for identifying that omission, it has been corrected in a 2.0 version of the RFP document that was released on May 15, 2026. The missing text, located on page 3 of the RFP document, has been added. The entire section now reads as follows: ANTICIPATED CONTRACT NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT A contract awarded pursuant to this Solicitation shall have a not to exceed (“NTE”) amount of \$1,800,000 for the total allowable maximum term. This amount is based on City’s estimated spend over the advertised contract term. Should City’s actual spend exceed its estimated spend, City may in its sole discretion increase the contract NTE for the initial term. Should City exercise its options to extend the contract beyond the initial term, City may also elect to increase the NTE proportionally.
Are suggested revisions to the City Contract terms considered as part of evaluation scoring/review?	No, the suggested revisions to the City Contract terms are not considered as part of evaluation scoring or review processes.

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
Does the Rating Bonus apply to all phases/points for the evaluation criteria?	The rating Bonus applies to the Written Proposal, Budget and Oral interviews. The Rating Bonus does not apply to Minimum Qualifications as this is a pass/fail situation.
Please confirm / clarify the need for Abuse and Molestation coverage. This is not a standard insurance for professional services / evaluation organizations that do not provide direct human services.	The need for Abuse and Molestation coverage is determined on a contract-by-contract basis depending on the anticipated level of interaction with vulnerable populations.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS QUESTIONS

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
Are current contracts reasonable to include as part of the minimum qualifications certification?	Yes, proposers may provide current or past contracts.
For the minimum qualifications, are you seeking a single contract that was 3 years long, or would it meet qualifications if we demonstrate more than 1 contract that together reflect 3 years?	As stated on page 17 of the RFP "Proposers may submit multiple contracts and/or Verification of Experience letters to meet the number of years required."
Regarding the Verification of Experience letter requirement: may the letter be issued by a school district or agency partner for an active, ongoing school improvement initiative, or must the referenced engagement be fully completed at the time of proposal submission?	Yes. Verification of Experience letters may be submitted for current, ongoing work and do not need to reflect a fully completed engagement at the time of proposal submission. However, the amount of experience that may be counted toward the Minimum Qualifications (MQs) will be limited to the period between the contract start date and the Intent to Apply deadline of May 24, 2026. Please note that proposers may submit multiple contracts and/or Verification of Experience letters to demonstrate the total number of years of experience required to meet the MQs.
The minimum qualifications requirement asks proposers to have "at least 3 years of experience working to design and implement a district-wide school improvement initiative for a large urban school district" however the verification letters asks clients to confirm that proposers have "experience delivering services similar in scope to those described in the Student Success Fund Evaluation RFP Request for Proposals." Does DCYF want verification that proposers have 3 year's experience designing and implementing district wide initiatives or that proposers have 3 year's experience evaluating district-wide initiatives?	DCYF is seeking verification that proposers have at least 3 years of experience providing services related to the design, implementation, and/or evaluation of district-wide school improvement initiatives for a large urban school district. The Minimum Qualifications are intended to allow for a range of relevant experience and organizational approaches related to the scope of work described in the RFP. Verification of Experience letters should confirm that the proposer has experience delivering services similar in scope, scale, and complexity to those described in the Student Success Fund Evaluation RFP.

SUBMITTED QUESTION	DCYF ANSWER
<p>The Minimum Qualifications require that “Proposers must have at least 3 years of experience working to design and implement a district-wide school improvement initiative for a large urban school district.” For purposes of meeting the MQ, whose years of experience are considered, the years of the experience of the entity (proposer) that enters into the contract or can it be the total sum of years of experience of the contractor and subcontractors in the proposal? For example, if there is a contractor and two subcontractors all with one year of experience for a total of three years experience, does that meet the MQ?</p>	<p>For the Past Experience Minimum Qualification DCYF will accept the combined experience of the contractor and subcontractor in order to meet the number of years needed.</p>
<p>The Minimum Qualifications require that “Proposers must have at least 3 years of experience working to design and implement a district-wide school improvement initiative for a large urban school district” and that DCYF will only accept contracts with either the City and County of San Francisco or SFUSD as verification for the three years. Can the proposer provide a contract with DCYF or SFUSD where the proposer is named as a subcontractor as verification? If not, will a letter of verification from the original DCYF or SFUSD contractor on behalf of the proposer suffice as evidence for meeting the MQs?</p>	<p>Contracts provided as verification for the Past Experience Minimum Qualification must be between the proposer and either the City and County of San Francisco or the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). Contracts where the proposer served solely as a subcontractor would not be accepted because the contractual relationship is between the City or SFUSD and the prime contractor, not the subcontractor. However, a proposer that performed relevant work as a subcontractor may provide a Verification of Experience letter in lieu of a direct contract. The letter may be provided either by the prime contractor that held the contract with the City or SFUSD or, where appropriate, by SFUSD or non-DCYF City staff if the subcontractor worked directly with them to complete the work. DCYF does not provide Verification of Experience letters.</p>
<p>The RFP states that DCYF will not provide Verification of Experience letters for proposers. Are verification letters from SFUSD acceptable?</p>	<p>Yes, proposers may obtain Verification of Experience letters from SFUSD.</p>
<p>The Minimum Qualifications require that “Proposers must have at least 3 years of experience working to design and implement a district-wide school improvement initiative for a large urban school district.” If the proposer is a former employee of a large urban school district, is a letter of verification from the school district required as evidence for meeting the MQ?</p>	<p>Yes, in this example, the former school district employee would need to provide a Verification of Experience letter from the school district verifying that the proposer performed work aligned with the Minimum Qualifications and relevant to the scope of the Student Success Fund Evaluation RFP.</p>