

Department Responses to Applicants' questions for RFA #100719JSET1, Kinship Navigator Grant

| Question Number | RFP Section Number | RFP Page Number | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | Section 1.7 | page 6 of the RFA | Please clarify the following related to the intended service area for this grant: | |
| 1.a | Section 1.7 | page 6 of the RFA | How did DCF identify the target counties in this section of the RFA? | This question is not pertinent to any response to this RFA. Nonetheless, the Department did so utilizing the relative placement reports. |
| 1.b | Section 1.4 | page 5 of the RFA | Is this RFA only open to agencies operating the Title IV-E Foster Care, Adoption Assistance or Guardian Assistance programs in the counties identified in this section of the RFA? | No. See Section 1.4 and Addendum #3 for the agency qualifications. |
| 1.c | Section 1.7 | page 6 of the RFA | Are the identified counties the only areas in the state the grant applicant may apply to grant funding to provide kinship navigations in? | Yes. But see 1.7, second sentence. |
| 1.d | Section 1.7 | page 6 of the RFA | Must the grant applicant provide kinship services in all the areas identified in RFA Section 1.7 or may the applicant choose to provide services in only one, or more, of these areas? | The applicant must serve all four counties listed in the RFA. See section 1.7. |
| 1.e | Section 1.4 | page 5 of the RFA | Must the applicant be the agency operating the Title IV-E Foster Care, Adoption Assistance or Guardian Assistance programs in the county for which they apply to offer services in or can an agency operating such programs in ANY area of the state provide services in a county for which they are not responsible for the identified programs? | The agency's current geographic scope does not limit their ability to apply for this grant. See 1.4. and Addendum #3 |
| 1.f | Section 1.4 | page 5 of the RFA | Must the applicant already be providing services in the counties identified in this RFA or may funds be used to expand services to these areas if a Kinship Navigator program is not already in place in the target county. | See response for 1.e, above. |

Department Responses to Applicants' questions for RFA #100719JSET1, Kinship Navigator Grant

| Question Number | RFP Section Number | RFP Page Number | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1.g | Sections 1.4.4.1.1, 2.1.2.1.3, 3.7.5.5, and 3.7.5.8.4. | Pages 5, 9, 19, and 20 of the RFA | If the applicant must provide Kinship Navigation services in all areas identified in RFA Section 1.7, does DCF expect the applicant to provide evidence of collaboration or subcontract with the CBC Lead Agencies responsible for the provision of services in each of the identified counties? | Yes. See Sections 1.4.4.1.1, 2.1.2.1.3, 3.7.5.5, and 3.7.5.8.4. |
| 2. | Section 3.7.5.9.1 | Page 20 of the RFA | May grant funding be used to support the evaluation of Kinship Navigator programs? | No. See Addendum #3. |
| 3. | NA | NA | As the evaluation of such programs constitutes Human Subject Research, does DCF have specific expectations or requirements related to the approval of project evaluation plans by an Institutional Review Board (IRB)? | DCF has no specific expectation or requirements on this topic. Please also see response to 2., above. |
| 4. | NA | NA | May the grantee select their own IRB or must they use the State of Florida's IRB? | See response to 3., above. |
| | Section 1.2 | page 4 of the RFA | <p>The RFA states it is intended to be used to enhance "their program" so it will ultimately meet the requirements of section 427(a)(1) of the social security act, ultimately leading to a "promising", "supported" or "well-supported" rating by the Clearinghouse (Chapter 6, Title IV-E Clearinghouse Handbook of Practice and Standards). To meet these requirements, the Clearinghouse has established the following research standards be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-supported. A program or service is rated as a well-supported practice if it has at least two contrasts with non-overlapping samples in studies carried out in usual care or practice settings (Title IV-E Clearinghouse | |

Department Responses to Applicants' questions for RFA #100719JSET1, Kinship Navigator Grant

| Question Number | RFP Section Number | RFP Page Number | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| | | | <p>Handbook of Practice and Standards, 6.2.2) that achieve a rating of moderate or high on design and execution and demonstrate favorable effects in a target outcome domain. At least one of the contrasts must demonstrate a sustained favorable effect of at least 12 months beyond the end of treatment (Clearinghouse Handbook, 6.2.3) on at least one target outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported. A program or service is rated as a supported practice if it has at least one contrast in a study carried out in a usual care or practice setting that achieves a rating of moderate or high on design and execution and demonstrates a sustained favorable effect of at least 6 months beyond the end of treatment on at least one target outcome. • Promising. A program or service is designated as a promising practice if it has at least one contrast in a study that achieves a rating of moderate or high on study design and execution and demonstrates a favorable effect on a target outcome. | |
| | | | With these requirements in mind: | |
| 5.a | NA | NA | Grant deliverables identified in RFA Section 2.5 are service “outputs” rather than specific activities which would lead to a Kinship Navigator program becoming evidence-based; what are the state’s expectations pertaining to the grantee conducting or participating in | See Addendum #3. |

Department Responses to Applicants' questions for RFA #100719JSET1, Kinship Navigator Grant

| Question Number | RFP Section Number | RFP Page Number | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | a "rigorous" evaluation which would meet the Clearinghouse's standards? | |
| 5.b | Section 3.7.5.9.2 | page 20 of the RFA | RFA Section 1.6; The project period identified by the state is not of sufficient duration to collect, aggregate, analyze, and publish data sufficient to meet criteria for any evidence based rating identified by the Clearinghouse, how does the state intend to support the sustainability of such efforts for a period long enough to meet Clearinghouse requirements? | Please refer to section 3.7.5.9.2 of the RFA as to the applicant's duties. |
| 5.c | Sections 3.7.5.9.1 and 3.7.10 | pages 20 and 21 of the RFA | Will the state accept a well-designed rigorous Quasi-Experimental Design, or must the experimental design used for evaluation include a Random Control Trial? | The Department has no opinion on this question. |
| | | | With regard to the statement "Their program", | |
| 5.d | Exhibit F and Addendum #2 | Page 35 of the RFA and Addendum #2 | The applicant may be implementing an evidence based Kinship Navigator model developed by an external party, in such case(s) please defined DCF's expectations regarding efforts to become evidence based, does this requirement apply to the applicant operating the kinship navigator program or the kinship navigator model selected, implemented and operated by the applicant? | See the definition of Program in Addendum #3. |
| 6. | Sections 1.4.3, 3.7.4.1.1, and 3.7.10 | pages 5, 18, and 21 of the RFA | Please describe the level of rigor expected of prior independent reviews or studies. | See sections 1.4.3, 2.1.1.1, 3.7.4.1.1, and 3.7.10 |
| 6.a | Sections 1.4.3, | pages 5, 18, and 21 of the RFA | Must such studies have been published in a peer-reviewed journal? | No |

Department Responses to Applicants' questions for RFA #100719JSET1, Kinship Navigator Grant

| Question Number | RFP Section Number | RFP Page Number | Question/Comment | Department Response |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | 3.7.4.1.1, and 3.7.10 | | | |
| 6.b | Sections 1.4.3, 3.7.4.1.1, and 3.7.10 | pages 5, 18, and 21 of the RFA | Must prior studies meet Clearinghouse standards which reach the level of a well-designed and executed study (high or moderate design)? | No |
| 6.c | Sections 1.4.3, 3.7.4.1.1, and 3.7.10 | pages 5, 18, and 21 of the RFA | Must prior studies identify specific contracts which align with child welfare outcomes expected by the Clearinghouse? | No |
| 7 | Table 2 | page 16 of the RFA | The state intends to publish responses to any questions on January 24, 2020 by 5pm. The application is due on January 27, 2020 at 5pm. This is less than a one-business day timeframe. As the state's responses to posed questions may require additional interagency collaboration or refinement of a written application, is the state willing to extend the due date for the response for this RFA? | See Addendum #1. |