

South Dakota Department of Labor and Regulation
Adult Education and Literacy Program
Responses to *Written Inquiries* for RFP # 1946
20 March 2020

- Section 1.6. Due to COVID-19, is it possible the RFP dates would be modified in the event of severe impacts to our infrastructure? How might COVID-19 affect the RFP process?

At this juncture, the Department of Labor and Regulation (DLR) will maintain the current timeline as articulated in RFP Section 1.6's **Schedule of Activities**—proposals are due no later than 5:00PM CDT on 10 April 2020.

Of course, all Applicants will be apprised if or when this timeline becomes subject to change. Additionally, the topic could be revisited during the scheduled *Applicants' Conference* on March 27th at 10am CDT.

- Section 1.17. Can you please provide additional information regarding the Restricted Indirect Cost Rate? Would cost allocation based on direct labor hours meet this requirement?

A **Restricted Indirect Cost Rate** is not required if hours can be accurately and reasonably direct-charged to a grant, even with a Cost Allocation Plan. However, if a Sub-Recipient wants to charge Indirect Costs, it must use a "Restricted" rate.

Because the South Dakota Department of Labor and Regulation can only accept a Restricted Indirect Cost Rate on the WIOA Title II grant, each successful Applicant must submit to DLR the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement with its federal cognizant agency [if the Applicant intends to charge Indirect Costs to the AEFLA grant]. If for some documentable reason your federal cognizant agency does not explicitly identify a "Restricted" rate, the Sub-Recipient may potentially use an 8% rate per 34 CFR 76.564.

<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2011-title34-vol1/pdf/CFR-2011-title34-vol1-sec76-564.pdf>

- Section 3.1. Must activities described as "adult education" include all three bullet points for each program participant?

Beyond the statutory definition for "adult education" in Section 3.1, the **General Scope** also details how successful Applicants could use the funds to operate one or more programs providing services or instruction in a host of listed categories.

Nonetheless, adult education activities under AEFLA should seek to increase an individual's ability to attain a high school equivalency, transition to postsecondary education or training, and obtain employment.

- Section 3.2.4. Can you please provide clarification regarding this section? What specifically is being measured, and how is the 50% determined? Will anecdotal evidence be considered in addition to hard data? If so, how should the anecdotal evidence be conveyed?

Regarding **Demonstrated Effectiveness**, an Applicant's performance for the listed domains and outcome-measures should be addressed as instructed in Section 2.2.3. If you are currently funded under AEFLA, then you should submit the requested tables; if you have not been previously funded under AEFLA, you should follow the respective instructions accordingly.

The Agency's aggregate figures, as they related to the 50% threshold noted in Section 3.2.4, are submitted annually to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE). OCTAE reviews and approves South Dakota's data as part of the National Reporting System [as required under WIOA Section 116]. In other words, your relevant data need to average at least half of the statewide figures in the given time frames.

While anecdotal testimony might prove appropriate elsewhere within your application, such evidence will not be used to determine Demonstrated Effectiveness (i.e., whether your organization's application will be further reviewed, scored, and considered for funding).

- Section 3.4. Could you provide a resource that would provide data/figures on Adults Without a high school diploma in the geographical areas [or by community] in South Dakota?

The U.S. Census Bureau is retiring American FactFinder on March 31, 2020. The U.S. Census Bureau is transitioning access instead to <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>. At this site, you would want to search **Educational Attainment**. From those results, you can customize your table and even filter your search by *Geography*.

- Section 4.6. Is there any preference given for programs who can provide a higher percentage of local match funds?

In terms of resource-consideration [such as Local Match], the **Scoring Rubric** accounts for the following:

- Service Need and Provider Capacity
- Alignment and Coordination
- Resources available to perform the work, including any specialized services, within the specified time limits for the project
- Record of past performance, including price and cost data from previous projects, quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cost control, and contract administration
- Proposed project management techniques

- Section 5.0. Are photographs and other graphics allowed as part of the proposal? Would it be acceptable to insert these within the body of the proposal, or may we include them in an addendum as additional supportive agency material? May we include letters of support from the business community or others?

If the **Proposal Guidelines** identified in the RFP are followed, then photographs/graphics and letters of support are acceptable. It is the Applicant's determination whether to include such information within the body of the proposal or as an addendum.

- Section 6.2.7. What circumstances would be considered "special project constraints"?

This criterion is a **State Specific Requirement**. In terms of circumstances, perhaps natural disasters, relocations, funding restraints, a midyear reinterpretation of a specific policy, or even a pandemic might constitute "special project constraints."

- Application Rubric. Is it possible to obtain copies of Application Rubrics and Comments from proposals to RFP # 876 in April 2017?

The **2017 Application Rubric** [for RFP # 876] is ostensibly the same as the 2020 Application Rubric [for RFP # 1946]. And although the Department of Labor and Regulation is not federally required to provide the rubric, the Agency decided to make this document available for the current grant-competition. However, the scored Application Rubrics and Comments [from both the 2017 and 2020 competitions] will not be shared or made publicly available.

