

RFP 15342
Early Intervention Program Monitoring and Quality Improvement Services
Questions and Answers

All questions received by the New York State Department of Health (Department) by the February 25, 2014 deadline are included. The Department is not responsible for any errors or misinterpretation of any questions received. The responses to questions included herein are the official responses by the State to questions posted by potential bidders and are hereby incorporated into RFP 15342 Early Intervention Program Monitoring and Quality Improvement Services issued on February 4, 2014. In the event of any conflict between the RFP and these responses, the requirements or information contained in these responses will prevail.

QUESTION 1: RFP Section A.1. QSR, pages 5-7.

The RFP states “verification of correction of noncompliance...” as a bullet under the scope of Monitoring Activities, Investigative Reviews, and Quality of Service Reviews (QSR) categories. On page 12, Verification of Correction Reviews (VCRs) is a separate category of review. Please clarify that when “verification of correction of noncompliance...” occurs, VCRs are a separate category of review for billing purposes, and are not considered part of other reviews for billing purposes.

RESPONSE 1: Verification Reviews (VRs) are a separate category of review for billing purposes, as noted on the Bid Detail Sheet, Attachment M.

QUESTION 2: RFP Section C.2.a.i., page 11, QSRs.

This paragraph states that, for QSRs, the contractor must use review staff that are considered a “qualified personnel.” Does the Department require a “qualified personnel” per PH Law Section 2541 to be part of the review team for Child Find or Service Coordination QSRs? If yes, for costing purposes, please provide an estimate of the number of Child Find or Service Coordination QSR reviews that would require a team member who was considered to be “qualified personnel”.

RESPONSE 2: As required for Evaluation and General Service QSRs, the Department requires that at least one member of the review team for Service Coordinator QSRs be "qualified personnel". The review teams for Child Find QSRs do not need to have a member that is "qualified personnel". Please refer to the Bid Detail Sheet, Attachment M, for the number of service coordinator QSRs to use when determining the cost.

QUESTION 3: RFP Section C.2.a.i., pages 11-12, QSRs and Section C.3.d, page 26.

Page 26 states that a QSR would “be conducted using a team of two individuals, unless otherwise specified by the Department.” Page 11 and 12 seem to infer that one staff member, appropriately qualified, would be adequate to perform a QSR (one person/one day). For costing purposes, please provide an estimate of the number of QSR reviews that would be completed using two staff members, and the number of QSR reviews that would be completed using one staff member.

RESPONSE 3: The number of review staff used to complete a QSR is up to the bidder. There is no required number. One staff member who has experience in all three service areas may be solely used to complete a QSR for service coordination, evaluation and general services. Please see page 11 of the RFP.

QUESTION 4: RFP Section C.2.a.i. QSR, page 12.

The RFP states “Direct observation of provider practices will be included during quality reviews conducted to determine the consistency and/or quality of provider practices when delivering services to children with certain diagnoses, or when delivering certain types of early intervention services.” Does this sentence infer that direct observation will be required only for certain QSR reviews, and not for all QSR reviews? Is direct observation required for all 500+ QSRs? If less than 100%, for costing purposes, what proportion of the total should be used?

QUESTION 5: RFP Section C.2.a.i. QSR, page 12.

The RFP states “Direct observation of provider practices will be included during quality reviews conducted to

determine the consistency and/or quality of provider practices when delivering services to children with certain diagnoses, or when delivering certain types of early intervention services.” Is direct observation required for all 300+ agency and IP reviews for Evaluation and General Services? If less than 100%, for costing purposes, what proportion of the total should be used?

QUESTION 6: RFP Section C.2.a.i. QSR, page 12.

The RFP states “Direct observation of provider practices will be included during quality reviews conducted to determine the consistency and/or quality of provider practices ...” Is direct observation required to take place for providers (agency, municipality provider, individual provider, subcontractor) while they serve children within the home & community-based setting? If so, what portion would be estimated to require direct observation within the home & community-based setting?

RESPONSE 4, 5 and 6: It is not the Department’s intent that every QSR include a direct observation of provider practices when delivering services to children with certain types of early intervention services and while they serve children within a community-based setting. Direct observations will only be required to occur for approximately 10% of the total amount of individual and agency QSRs. It is not expected that direct observation will be required for services provided in a child's home. The exact number of QSRs which include observation will be determined by the Department during the contract period.

QUESTION 7: RFP Section C.3.a.ii., page 14.

The RFP states that the bidder must budget for the full target numbers for each type of review but that the Department does not guarantee that these target numbers of reviews will be assigned to the contracted staff. The bid price is required to be a per review price. If the Department authorizes/approves the hiring of the full complement of staff representing the full target number for a specific review type and then fails to assign the target number of reviews how will the bidder be compensated for the excess staff? Alternatively, will the Department consider a tiered pricing model whereby a bid includes one price for a base volume (e.g., 50% of the projected total) and another price for any reviews that go above the base number?

RESPONSE 7: The bid sheet reflects the Department’s best current estimates of the volume of annual deliverables over the five year contract period. The Department will not revise the pricing methodology to reflect tiered pricing. The Department reserves the right to adjust the number of reviews during the contract period and bidders should submit a price based upon this information.

QUESTION 8: RFP Section C.3.c.ii., page 18.

The RFP states that the contractor is required to ensure that the monitoring data application and associated database can be linked to NYEIS. Can the department provide the specifications for NYEIS linkage that the contractor will need to estimate the cost of developing this interface? If the interface capability already exists, please provide a description of what the contractor will need to do in addition to the existing interface.

RESPONSE 8: Page 18 of the RFP states that the monitoring data application and associated database must be modified so that it can be linked to NYEIS. The Department has decided not to require the contractor to link the monitoring data application and associated data base to NYEIS.

QUESTION 9: RFP Section C.2.b.ii, page 19 (3rd and 4th bullets at top of page.

Are the QSR reviews referenced in the third bullet the same as the “clinical record reviews” referenced in the fourth bullet? If not, what is the difference?

RESPONSE 9: No, these are different reviews. Page 7 of the RFP lists all of the activities that may be required for the QSR. Page 16 of the RFP describes the activities that may be required for the clinical record review.

QUESTION 10: RFP Section C.3.b, page 21.

The last paragraph references the “Systems Manager.” Is this the same position as the “Early Intervention Data Manager” in Section C.3.c.v. on page 24?

RESPONSE 10: Yes, this is the same position.

QUESTION 11: RFP Section C.3.c.iii, page 23.

Are the “Quality Assurance Specialists” mentioned in this paragraph the same positions as the Quality Review Specialists in Section C.3.c.iv.?

RESPONSE 11: Yes, these are the same positions.

QUESTION 12: RFP Section C.3.c.v, page 25.

The Cost Proposal Bid Detail Sheet provides for 120 hours per year to modify the monitoring application. The RFP includes review categories that are not part of the current program. Substantial modifications and/or new work will be required to fulfill the system requirements in this RFP. 120 hours will be insufficient to cover these requirements. How should hours for the additional work required for the new system be budgeted? Where should these costs be captured? In a separate line or within the per review rate?

RESPONSE 12: Total hours for modifying the monitoring application will not change. The Department has budgeted 120 hours for modification of the monitoring application. Any additional cost in excess of the 120 hours should be factored into the price per deliverable.

QUESTION 13: RFP Section D.1.a., page 31.

11 point font or larger is required for the technical proposal. May tables, charts and graphics use a smaller font, e.g., 9 point?

RESPONSE 13: Yes. Charts and graphics may use a font size that is less than 11.

QUESTION 14: RFP Section D.1.a., page 31.

Please confirm that the 20 page limit applies only to the “Proposal Narrative” portion of the Technical Proposal (D.1.a.) and not the remaining portions (D.1.b. through D.1.f.)

RESPONSE 14: The page limit for Section D.1.a. *Proposal Narrative* is 20 pages.

The combined page limit for Sections D.1.b and c, *Project Activities to Meet Deliverables* and *Persons Responsible and Completion Dates* is 10 pages.

QUESTION 15: RFP Section D.1.a., page 31.

May the Technical Proposal Work Plan be constructed single spaced instead of double spaced?

RESPONSE 15: Yes.

QUESTION 16: RFP Section D.1.c., page 31.

Does the 11-point font requirement apply to the attachments (e.g., Attachment K)?

RESPONSE 16: A minimum of 10-point font can be used to complete attachments.

QUESTION 17: RFP Section D.1.c., page 31-32.

Section D.1.c. of the RFP includes requirements for “a detailed timeline” and beginning and completion dates for activities, in addition to the information related to persons responsible. Since it appears that this requirement repeats information required in Section D.1.b., please clarify whether the information in D.1.b. (Project Activities to Meet Deliverables, including completion of Attachment K) should be repeated in the Persons Responsible and Completion Dates portion of the technical proposal.

QUESTION 18: RFP Section D.1.b. and D.1.c., page 31 and 32.

The instructions immediately above Section D.1.b. state “for describing “b” and “c” below, use the Technical

Proposal Work Plan template form provided as Attachment K.” This form has four columns, 1. Deliverable; 2. Activities to Meet Deliverable; 3. Person(s) Responsible; and 4. Timeline for Completion. The requirements to be addressed in sections “b” and “c” appear to be more detailed than the four columns. For example, one of the requirements states that the bidder must address “what activities are to be accomplished and under what conditions; the nature and scope of the activities that lead to the successful completion of each deliverable; and, how the contract activities presented in the proposal will be delivered.” Is all of this information to be included under “2. Activities to Meet Deliverable” on Attachment K or is some of it to be included in a narrative in the main proposal with abbreviated information on each activity included on Attachment K? If the former, is the information included in the page count? If the latter, given all of the activities/deliverables, it seems that the 10-page limit is too short.

RESPONSE 17 and 18: Attachment K, page 111 of the RFP references the chart in which the bidder must include abbreviated information regarding the Deliverable, Activities to Meet the Deliverable, Person Responsible and Timeline for Completion. The details of these activities must be included in the narrative, as required by Section D.1. a, b, and c. on page 31-32 of the RFP. .

QUESTION 19: RFP Section D.1.f.ii., page 33.

The RFP states that “Preference is given to bidders resumes for the Project Manager, Monitoring Coordinator, Data Manager, and monitoring staff as detailed in Section C.3.c.” Other than this reference, Section D.1.f.ii. relates to contract references. Please clarify what references are to be provided in this section – contract references or references for individual staff members.

RESPONSE 19: The RFP requires submission of contract references, as indicated in Section D.1.f.ii, on page 33. Failure to submit these references will result in a rejection of the bid. Additionally, page 33 states that preference is given to bidders who submit resumes for the Project Manager, Monitoring Coordinator, Data Manager and monitoring staff. These resumes will be reviewed and scored as part of the technical evaluation.

QUESTION 20: RFP Section E.3.b., page 39.

The RFP requires submission of two original and five signed copies of the Technical Proposal. Please clarify whether the five copies must contain original signatures or if only the two originals must contain original signatures.

RESPONSE 20: The two originals must each contain ink signatures. The five copies can include a copy of the original signatures.

QUESTION 21: RFP Section E.5., page 41.

Under payment terms section, please explain the meaning of “...and Optionally for services performed as part of the separate program monitoring component.”

RESPONSE 21: This is an error. The quoted portion of the Payment Terms in RFP Section E.5., page 41, is considered removed by the publication of this Q&A document.

QUESTION 22: RFP Section E.5., page 42.

The RFP, on page 42 states that a “review will be considered eligible for 100% of payment when the pre review and onsite review activities are completed, and the report is issued.” On Page 42 paragraph 2, the RFP states that a “review will be considered complete and eligible for payment when the CAP response is released to the provider by the Department...” On page 113, the RFP states that “reviews will be paid 100% of the total payment when the monitoring CAP response is completed to the satisfaction of the Department.” Please clarify this apparent conflict. If the payment is to be made only after the Department has released the CAP response to the provider, there may be substantial lag in payment after the successful contractor has completed -or has been available to complete- their work in a timely manner. How will the successful contractor be paid when there is a delay or disruption to the CAP process, i.e., when a CAP is required and the provider does not return the CAP, or does not return the CAP in a timely manner?

RESPONSE 22: The references referred to in the question are not correct. In order for the contractor to receive 100% of the payment for the review deliverable, the pre review activities, onsite review activities, monitoring report and CAP response must be completed to the satisfaction of the Department unless the provider withdraws from the program and never submits a CAP, or the Department takes over 90 days to approve the CAP response. Should there be delays in providers submitting their CAPS beyond the expected due date, the Department will approve payment to the contractor as long as the contractors complete the other deliverables to the satisfaction of the Department. Should there be exceptional instances where CAP responses completed by the Department are delayed; the Department will work with the contractor to ensure prompt payment for satisfactory deliverables.

QUESTION 23: RFP Attachment M, page 114-115 (Cost Proposal Bid Detail Sheet).

The contract deliverables list in the Cost Proposal Bid Detail Sheet is not itemized in the same manner as the activities/deliverables detailed in Section C. Below are two tables that compare the items in Attachment M with the items in Section C and our attempt at matching them. Please confirm or correct the “matching” on these two lists and please complete any missing matches in order that we may fully understand which portions of the scope of work are included in each of the individual items in the cost detail sheet. (Note: the “Ref” column was added to assist in the “matching” process.)

Ref	Contract Deliverables (From Attachment M)	Ref C.
A.	Comprehensive Reviews for Regulation Compliance (including CAP reviews)	
A.1	Agency Reviews (including municipalities)	a.1
A.2	Individual Reviews	a.1
A.3	Verification Reviews	a.1
A.4	Clinical Record Reviews	c.1
A.5	Investigative Reviews (including CAP reviews)	a.2
B.	Quality of Service Reviews – Agencies, including municipalities. (including CAP reviews)	
B.1	Child Find	a.3
B.2	Service Coordination	a.3
B.3	Evaluation	a.3
B.4	General Services	a.3
C.	Quality of Service Reviews - Individuals (including CAP reviews)	
C.1	Service Coordination	a.3
C.2	Evaluation	a.3
C.3	General Services	a.3
D.	Monitoring Application	
D.1	Modify Monitoring Application	d.2
D.2	Maintain Monitoring Application & House Data	d.1, d.3
E.	Administrative Services	
E.1	Administrative Services	e.1

Ref	Work Plan Activities and Deliverables (From Section C.2)	Ref M.
a.	EI Monitoring Reviews: Types	
a.1	Comprehensive EI Monitoring Reviews for Regulatory Compliance (CRRC)	A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4
a.2	Investigative Monitoring Reviews (IMR)	A.5
a.3	Quality of Service Reviews (QSR)	C.1, C.2, C.3
b.	EI Monitoring Reviews Deliverables	
b.1	Monitoring Reviews	
b.2	Monitoring Reports	
b.3	Corrective Action Plans	
c.	EI Clinical Record Reviews	
c.1	EI Clinical Record Reviews	A.4
d.	EI Monitoring Data	
d.1	Maintain EI Monitoring Application and Store EI Monitoring Data	D.2

Ref	Work Plan Activities and Deliverables (From Section C.2)	Ref M.
d.2	Modify EI data Application	D.1
d.3	Maintain EI Data Application	D.2
d.4	Turnover	n/a
e.	Administrative Services and Supports	
e.1	Administrative Services and Supports	E.1

RESPONSE 23: Attachment M, EI Cost Proposal Bid Detail Sheet, is where the bidder needs to propose a price for each type of contract deliverables, which are broken down by the different types of reviews. Section C. of the RFP describes the details and specific requirements for each contract deliverable review, for which a cost must be listed on Attachment M.

Section C should be reviewed to ensure that the bidder provides an accurate cost for each contract deliverable review taking into consideration that the cost of the review, report and corrective action plan are included as a requirement for each comprehensive review, investigative review and quality of service review and are not separately billable deliverables. Additionally, turnover is not a billable activity and therefore, not included in Attachment M.

QUESTION 24: RFP Attachment M., page 114, Cost Proposal Bid Detail Sheet.
What is the current annual value of the EI Program Monitoring contract?

RESPONSE 24: The Department is not releasing the annual amount budgeted for the contract to be awarded under this procurement. The amount of the previous contract with Island Peer Review Organization (IPRO) for these services can be obtained at www.openbooknewyork.com.