

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
VIRTUAL ADVANCED PLACEMENT (VAP) PROGRAM- ROUND 2
RFP #SA-14

ELIGIBILITY

Question 1 If a district is not on the eligibility list in appendix B of the RFP but it is believed that the district does meet the criterion of 25% or higher of enrolled students meet the poverty threshold criteria as specified in the RFP, can the district provide a letter of intent from the Superintendent and be included in a BOCES or BOCES consortium led application and participate in VAP Round II?

Answer: To confirm whether a district is eligible to participate in an application in response to this RFP because 25% of the enrolled students meet the poverty threshold criteria as specified, the district did not participate in VAP Round 1, and the district is not included on the list of eligible districts, please contact NYSED at VirtualNY2@mail.nysed.gov.

Question 2: Can a public school that is not part of a district, but is run by a BOCES, so long as they can provide verifiable data that their enrolled students meet the poverty threshold as established in the RFP provide an LOI and be included as a participant in a BOCES or BOCES-consortium led application?

Answer: Please see the answer in question 1, above, for a response to this question.

Question 3: How can school districts meeting the eligibility requirements who are component districts of BOCES participating in VAP Round I, but the district is not a participant in the Round I award, participate in Round II?

Answer: An eligible district that is a component of a BOCES participating in VAP Round I – and the BOCES is therefore not eligible to participate in Round II – but the district is not a participant in their BOCES Round I award may provide an LOI and participate in the application and award with a Round II eligible BOCES or BOCES-led consortium. Round II eligible BOCES or BOCES-led consortiums may - but are not required - to allow eligible districts that are not component districts provide LOIs and participate in applications and awards. All eligible component districts of eligible BOCES included as either the lead BOCES or a BOCES consortium participant must be invited to submit an LOI to participate.

Question 4: Can a BOCES who is a participant in a VAP Round I BOCES consortium of BOCES, but not the lead fiscal agent, be the fiscal agent for eligible component districts not participating in Round I in a Round II application?

Answer: No. A BOCES with a signed LOI who is participating in VAP Round I - whether they are a lead fiscal agent or not - is not eligible to apply or be included as a participant in a Round II application. Part of the purpose of VAP Round II is to provide funds for the goals expressed in the RFP to BOCES and districts who did not participate in Round I funding.

Question 5: If a BOCES was the fiscal agent or a participant in a VAP Round 1 award, does this prevent them from providing purchased service such as professional development for a new cadre of districts in Round 2?

Answer: No, A BOCES who is a lead applicant or participant in VAP Round I cannot be a fiscal agent or a consortium participant but is not entirely restricted from providing services at the request of BOCES receiving awards in round II. Some restrictions may apply, such as sub-contracting for services may not exceed 30% of the budget. Within these limits, a BOCES participating in Round I may also provide services or contract with Round II BOCES awardees.

Question 6: The RFP states: "Applications must first meet the mandatory requirements set forth to advance to the programmatic scoring. In accordance with the Attachment E certification, attachments will be reviewed by an evaluation team to confirm that the mandatory requirements have been met. If an application fails to meet all of the mandatory requirements the application will be disqualified and removed from further consideration." However, the attachments only go up to "C", and Appendices go up to "D". Where might I locate the Attachment E?

Answer: The use of 'E' in reference to the attachment for mandatory requirements on page 10 of the RFP was a typographical error. It should have read "attachment C".

Question 7: Would you be able to let us know what the full time frame of the grant is? We are seeing the dates of August 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015. Is this a one year grant?

Answer: Yes, these are the correct dates, and this is an 11 month grant.

Question 8: On page 10 and again on page 11, the RFP states that the BOCES lead applicant/fiscal agent must provide a minimum of 20% of the direct program services or activities funded by this grant, but on page 29 it states that this minimum is twenty-five percent?

Answer: The BOCES lead applicant/fiscal agent must provide a minimum of 20% of the direct program services or activities funded by this grant. The reference to "twenty-five percent" on page 29 is a typographical error.

Question 9: On page 80 in the RFP it reads "If it is believed that a district is eligible to submit an application in response to this RFP...". Are districts eligible to submit applications for this RFP?

Answer: Only public school districts in a city having a population in excess of one hundred twenty-five thousand inhabitants, which have at least 25% of students from low-income families as determined using the criteria specified under section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and are not a component of the board of cooperative educational services of the supervisory district serving its geographic area, exclusive of any district which received an award in response to RFP Proposal SA-08, may submit an application to this RFP. Page 80 in the RFP should have read "If it is believed that a district is

eligible to *participate* in an application in response to this RFP because 25% of *the* enrolled students meet the above poverty threshold criteria....”

The RFP has been updated to reflect the corrections noted in answers to question #'s 6, 8, and 9.