



UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

Procurement Services

3544 Perseus Loop #160975

Orlando, FL 32816

<https://procurement.ucf.edu/solicitations/>

Stefanie.DelGiudice@ucf.edu

ADDENDUM I

IMPORTANT DOCUMENT – INVITATION TO NEGOTIATE

ITN NUMBER: 2025-12DCSA

ITN TITLE: Data-Driven Continuous Improvement and Technical Assistance Services for Community Partnership Schools

OPENING DATE & TIME: Friday, May 29, 2026 @ 3:00 PM

ADDENDUM NUMBER: I ADDENDUM DATE: Monday, May 18, 2026

The purpose of this addendum is to:

- Answer questions asked during the q/a period.
- To remove Section 2.36(D) in its' entirety. Sections 2.36 (A, B, and C) remain in effect.
- To extend the due date for proposals to Friday, May 29, 2026 @ 3:00 PM

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM AND RETURN IT WITH YOUR OFFER (I.E. UPLOAD TO BONFIRE). FAILURE TO SIGN AND RETURN WITH YOUR OFFER COULD RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER.

PROPOSERS SIGNATURE

PRINT OR TYPE PROPOSER'S NAME

COMPANY NAME

EMAIL ADDRESS

1) Supplier Question:

a) How do I submit a proposal for this bid?

UCF Answer:

See Section **3.0 REQUIRED OFFER FORMAT** (page 29 of the ITN)

The Respondent shall not alter the ITN in any way and shall not reproduce all or any part of the ITN in its offer document. The contract, if any, resulting from this ITN shall incorporate the entire ITN and proposal by reference.

To facilitate analysis of its offer, the Respondent is to prepare its offer in accordance with the instructions outlined in section 3.0 REQUIRED OFFER FORMAT.

UCF EMPHASIZES THAT THE RESPONDENT CONCENTRATE ON ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, AND CLARITY OF CONTENT. The Respondent is encouraged to use sections and tabs that are clearly identified and number and label all parts, pages, figures, and tables in its proposal submittal/offer. Additional tabs may be appended which contain any other pertinent matters that the Respondent wishes UCF to take into consideration in reviewing the offer. The Respondent's response to this ITN must be submitted via UCF's Bonfire Web Portal, as listed in Section 2.6.

b) What are the required documents?

UCF Answer:

See Section 3.2 Respondent/Offer Submittal Sections (page 29 of the ITN)

Respondent Documents (At a Minimum):

- Proposal
- Experience and Qualifications of Proposer
- Project Staff Qualifications/Experience
- Price List

UCF Documents:

- Acknowledgement Form (page 1 of ITN)
- Appendix I (pages 31-33 of ITN)*
*Mark YES or NO for each Section. Initial each line.
- Appendix II (page 34 of ITN)
- Addendum I

c) Where should the proposal be submitted?

UCF Answer:

<https://ucfprocurement.bonfirehub.com/opportunities/230984>

d) What are the next steps?

UCF Answer:

Offers will be opened on Thursday, May 21, 2026 @ 3:00 p.m. via Zoom.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://ucf.zoom.us/j/98587090588?pwd=wUHABxZ3WbRuReP1evvoTwVVeChcXa.1>

Meeting ID: 985 8709 0588

Passcode: 882111

During the Evaluation Process, the Procurement and Contracts Specialist will communicate with prospective suppliers via e-mail (i.e. no telephone calls) as required. Do not contact the department directly.

Updates will be posted to the UCF Procurement Services website: <https://procurement.ucf.edu/solicitations/>

2) Supplier Question:

How does the UCF Center for Community Schools define “technical assistance” within the CPS model—particularly in relation to capacity-building, systems improvement, and partner coordination?

UCF Answer:

- **Technical Assistance** is the strategic provision of specialized expertise and coaching, research-backed training, and targeted resources designed to facilitate the high-quality implementation and sustainability of the Community Partnership Schools™ (CPS) model. It serves as a catalyst for:
- **Capacity Building:** Strengthening the knowledge base and skillsets of practitioners and core partners to meet the evolving demands of the community school field.
- **Systems Improvement:** Driving continuous improvement through the collection and analysis of data—such as attendance, behavior, and achievement—to support data-driven decision-making at every level. Systems level data is also collected in qualitative and quantitative formats to drive systemic decision making. All technical assistance supports incorporate continuous improvement through surveys.
- **Partner Coordination:** Fostering collaborative governance and sustainable linkages between school districts, universities, healthcare providers, and nonprofits to ensure a unified approach to supporting the whole child.

3) Supplier Question:

Will the selected supplier be expected to deploy staff on-site, remotely, or in a hybrid model across CPS locations?

UCF Answer:

Hybrid. When on-site is needed for in-person convenings, it would most likely be in a centralized location, rather than at each school site. Other meetings will be virtual.

4) Supplier Question:

What data systems are currently in use across CPS sites (e.g., dashboards, student information systems), and how are they leveraged to inform continuous improvement efforts?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center for Community Schools (UCF CCS or UCF Center) currently utilizes a data management platform called Learning Circle. Data-sharing agreements have been established with the majority of school districts in which there are community school sites associated with UCF. Data from each school district feeds into the Learning Circle platform nightly which includes attendance, behavior, and course grade records for each student. Sites can then track student participation in programs, supports, and events in the platform. Not all sites are entering participation data, but many are, and the UCF Center continues to train and encourage sites to enter the data. Learning Circle has built, and continues to build, reports to demonstrate impact. Program and service data are also reported by the sites quarterly as part of their quarterly reporting deliverable. These numbers are reported aggregately.

The UCF Center has a data sharing agreement with the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) allowing the UCF Center to enhance student data records with additional information from the Department when needed. Files received from FDOE are de-identified.

CPS sites undergo model fidelity assessments at 3 years (readiness) and 5 years (certification, then every additional 5 years for recertification). The process includes a narrative written by the site director, evidence documents, a tour of the school, stakeholder input surveys, and focus groups with staff and various stakeholder groups. This process culminates with a comprehensive report of findings. The assessment report includes strengths, recommendations, and scores in each area of the certification rubric.

These systems are currently leveraged to support activities such as:

Tracking implementation progress and CPS activities

- Conducting needs assessments and identifying priority areas
- Monitoring partnerships, services, and engagement efforts
- Supporting reporting and compliance requirements
- Informing technical assistance and coaching conversations
- Identifying trends and opportunities for continuous improvement across sites
- The overall data environment is still evolving and is not fully standardized across all CPS sites. One of the goals of this engagement is to help strengthen alignment, consistency, usability, and integration of these systems and practices so that data can be more effectively leveraged for decision-making, implementation support, and long-term continuous improvement across the statewide CPS network.
- In short, data sources include District data in Learning Circle, student participation data in Learning Circle, quarterly reports, and other deliverables, FDOE, and certification assessment reports.

All data collection is FERPA compliant.

5) Supplier Question:

What governance structure is in place for decision-making across partners (UCF, nonprofits, districts, healthcare agencies)?

UCF Answer:

Each Community Partnership School (CPS) site drafts and executes a Memorandum of Understanding among the core partners (non-profit, school district, healthcare, and university/college partner). The MOU outlines the long-term commitment and how the partners will work together. The expectation of the model is a collaborative governance structure consisting of a long-term committed partnership among core partners via a Cabinet that lead the Community Partnership School.

For clarity, the UCF Center for Community Schools is not the “university partner” to the CPS sites. CPS sites in Orange County partner with other UCF departments, colleges, or units to serve as the university partner.

Between UCF and the non-profit (the fiscal agent), there is a contract associated with the grant received by the non-profit from UCF.

6) Supplier Question:

What level of staffing capacity and role specialization is expected to effectively support implementation across all 50 sites?

UCF Answer:

Effectively supporting implementation across all 50 Community Partnership School (CPS) sites will require a balance of regionalized relationship-based support and centralized technical expertise. Currently, the UCF Center for Community Schools organizes sites into four regional cohorts, which has strengthened peer learning, responsiveness, and targeted technical assistance. Building on this model, successful implementation at scale would likely require regional leads or coaches to support a portfolio of schools, alongside specialized staff focused on areas such as data and continuous improvement, integrated student supports, sustainability planning, and partnership development. We are also open to innovative approaches that leverage peer coaching networks, virtual technical assistance, or shared-service models to maximize efficiency while maintaining strong site-level support. Ultimately, staffing capacity should reflect both the scale of the initiative and the depth of support necessary to ensure high-quality implementation and long-term impact across diverse communities.

Additionally, the UCF Center for Community Schools has launched an online training academy, with the goal of incorporating a flipped classroom into all technical assistance efforts. This could also be an opportunity to address scaling, sustainability, and staffing capacity.

7) Supplier Question:

Will implementation be phased, or should respondents plan for full-scale deployment at contract start?

UCF Answer:

Implementation will be phased.

8) Supplier Question:

Is the budget structured as fixed-price, cost-reimbursable, or milestone-based?

UCF Answer:

See Section 3.2 Respondent/Offer Submittal Sections (page 30 of the ITN)

D. OVERALL PRICING

1. The proposal submitted in response to this ITN should enumerate a fixed fee.
2. The proposal should specify billing rates for the various personnel who will be involved in the activities being proposed.
3. The proposal should list any other categories of ancillary expenses that may be billed.

Note: The University will not reimburse travel, meals, or lodging expenses.

9) Supplier Question:

What have been the most significant implementation challenges across CPS sites to date?

UCF Answer:

Some of the most significant implementation challenges across Community Partnership School (CPS) sites have centered on sustaining staffing capacity, navigating leadership transitions, aligning cross-sector partnerships, and building the infrastructure necessary for long-term coordination and data-driven decision-making. Sites also vary in readiness and local context, which can impact the pace of implementation and the ability to fully operationalize the model.

10) Supplier Question:

Are there opportunities for the selected supplier to contribute to documentation, case studies, or scalable models that support broader replication efforts?

UCF Answer:

Yes

11) Supplier Question:

Coaching volume specificity:

- a) Does 'monthly virtual coaching sessions' mean one session per director per month, or one group session for all directors?

UCF Answer:

“Monthly virtual coaching sessions” may include a combination of both formats:

Individual coaching sessions (e.g., one-on-one support for CPS directors or site/regional nonprofit leads based on specific needs, implementation challenges, or readiness level), and Group coaching sessions (e.g., cohort-based, or regional sessions where multiple directors/regional nonprofit leads engage in shared learning, problem-solving, and peer exchange). The intent is not to prescribe a single delivery format, but to ensure regular, structured engagement with CPS leadership that supports implementation, continuous improvement, and network learning. Respondents should propose a model that balances efficiency with responsiveness and may differentiate between group and individual coaching based on site maturity, priorities, or technical assistance needs.

b) Is there one CPS Director per school?

UCF Answer:

Yes

12) Supplier Question:

Training: How many UCF Center for Community Schools staff will participate in the virtual train-the-trainer sessions?

UCF Answer:

Up to 10

13) Supplier Question:

Convenings format: Will the contractor design AND facilitate the bi-annual convenings, or provide technical assistance to UCF staff who will facilitate them?

UCF Answer:

The contractor will design and facilitate bi-annual convenings during the contract period, and the Technical Assistance/Assessment and Evaluation team will take the lead after the contract ends. To avoid duplication, there may be cases when the contractor partners with the Technical Assistance team for the in person convenings during the contract term.

14) Supplier Question:

Data tools: Is the contractor developing custom tools for these 50 sites, or implementing existing validated tools?

UCF Answer:

The contractor will develop customized tools for the Community Partnership School initiative to streamline progress monitoring.

15) Supplier Question:

Travel: Travel is subject to approval. Should travel be excluded from the cost proposal?

UCF Answer:

The University will not reimburse travel, meals, or lodging expenses. Those expenses should be built into the contract's fixed price.

16) Supplier Question:

Are dashboards to be public or only available to UCF staff site directors and site teams?

UCF Answer:

Dashboards will be available to in-network community schools, the UCF Center For Community Schools, and authorized providers.

17) Supplier Question:

Does UCF have a preferred platform for the dashboards (powerBI, Excel, other)?

UCF Answer:

Not specifically. This can be discussed, and the pros and cons of each option weighed to determine the best fit. It may be necessary that the platform is a "UCF-approved" software.

18) Supplier Question:

Should the bidder include the cost of dashboard software licenses for UCF staff, site directors, and team members in their budget?

UCF Answer:

Yes

19) Supplier Question:

Should the bidder include the costs for the venue participant travel, and other in person meeting related costs for the annual data summits and bi-annual in-person convenings?

UCF Answer:

The University will not reimburse travel, meals, or lodging expenses. Those expenses should be built into the contract's fixed price. However, the UCF Center will cover venue/space costs for the location of the convening.

20) Supplier Question:

Are the network learning opportunities and collaboration activities (convenings, communities of practice, other structures for shared learning) expected to be part of the monthly coaching sessions with participating CPS directors or in addition to them?

UCF Answer:

In addition to them. The purpose of each (monthly coaching & network learning) are different, therefore one does not replace the other.

21) Supplier Question:

Are the monthly virtual coaching sessions with CPS directors expected to be one on one, or can they be done in small groups based on similar needs, demographics, implementation challenges, etc. to promote shared learning and collaboration?

UCF Answer:

One on one coaching is the baseline, but the UCF Center for Community Schools is open to an adaptable format where group coaching is provided. Groups will primarily be associated with established regions of the state.

22) Supplier Question:

Section 3.2, D.3. states in the note that the university will not reimburse travel meals, or lodging expenses. Does this mean that the university will not cover the cost the bidder staff travel of the biannual convenings and annual data summit?

UCF Answer:

These costs should be included in the overall contract's fixed price.

23) Supplier Question:

What is the estimated budget or budget range for this work?

UCF Answer:

\$275,000 to negotiable per year of contract.

24) Supplier Question:

What is the expectation for length of the bi-annual in-person convenings (1 day, multi-day, etc.)?

UCF Answer:

One day is the expectation for bi-annual in-person convenings, plus any train-the-trainer hours.

25) Supplier Question:

- a) What data (if any) does UCF already collect to understand implementation of Community Schools?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center utilizes the Learning Circle data management platform. Data-sharing agreements have been established with the majority of school districts in which there are community school sites associated with UCF. Data from each school district feeds into the Learning Circle platform nightly which includes attendance, behavior, and course grade records for each student. Sites can then track student participation in programs, supports, and events in the platform. Not all sites are entering participation data, but many are, and the UCF Center continues to train and encourage sites to enter the data. Learning Circle has built and continues to build reports to demonstrate impact. (District data uploaded daily; student participation data varies based on site entry of information). Learning Circle is “live,” so data is available as soon as it is entered into the platform.

Program and service data are also reported by the sites as part of their quarterly reporting deliverable. These numbers are reported in aggregate. Quarterly reports are quarterly; other deliverables are annual. These reports would be available after being submitted and approved, approximately 2 months following the end of the quarter.

The UCF Center has a data sharing agreement with Florida Department of Education (FDOE) allowing us to enhance student data records with additional information from the Department when needed. Files received from FDOE are de-identified (when obtained from FDOE website or requested from FDOE). Data points from FDOE are available at different times in the year, dependent upon FDOE data processes and publishing.

CPS sites undergo model fidelity assessments at 3 years (readiness) and 5 years (certification, then every additional 5 years for recertification). The process includes a narrative written by the site director, evidence documents, a tour of the school, stakeholder input surveys, and focus groups with staff and various stakeholder groups. This process culminates with a comprehensive report of findings. The assessment report includes strengths, recommendations, and scores in each area of the certification rubric (when assessments are completed; implementation years 3, 5, 10, 15, etc). These reports are available 6 weeks after completion of the assessment.

In short, data sources include District data in Learning Circle, student participation data in Learning Circle, quarterly reports, and other deliverables, FDOE, and certification assessment reports.

All data collection is FERPA compliant.

b) How frequently are these data collected and when do they become available?

UCF Answer:

See above.

26) Supplier Question:

Is this ITN intended to replace, continue, supplement, or expand any existing contract, grant-funded support, data platform, technical-assistance arrangement, or evaluation engagement currently supporting the UCF Center for Community Schools or Community Partnership Schools? If yes, please identify the incumbent vendor(s), current scope of services, period of performance, and any services expected to continue under an existing arrangement.

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center has engaged in a pilot initiative over the past year. The supplier will build upon the current structures in the center and the progress made to prepare sites and the UCF Center's technical assistance team to continue the initiative by end of this contract.

27) Supplier Question:

Will UCF consider proposals from suppliers offering a defined subset of services, such as convenings, executive coaching, leadership development, facilitation, training workshops, and train-the-trainer support, rather than the full scope described in Section 1.1?

UCF Answer:

UCF Center for Community Schools is seeking a supplier that can provide a proposal for the full scope.

28) Supplier Question:

If partial-scope proposals are permitted, how will they be evaluated relative to full-scope submissions, particularly under the "overall responsiveness" criterion?

UCF Answer:

UCF Center for Community Schools is seeking a supplier that can provide a proposal to perform the full scope.

29) Supplier Question:

Does UCF anticipate making multiple awards by functional area or service category, or is the intent to award to a single comprehensive supplier?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center for Community Schools aims to award a single comprehensive supplier.

30) Supplier Question:

a) May a supplier submit a limited-scope proposal as a prime respondent and also participate as a proposed subcontractor or sub-consultant on another respondent's proposal under the same ITN?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center for Community Schools is requesting a full proposal, not limited in scope.

- b) If permitted, please clarify any required disclosures or limitations to avoid non-responsiveness, conflicts of interest, or anti-collusion concerns.

UCF Answer:

N/A

31) Supplier Question:

Does UCF anticipate that the selected supplier will be required to use, integrate with, or coordinate with any existing UCF-designated data platform(s), such as Learning Circle or similar systems?

UCF Answer:

Yes, Learning Circle/other.

32) Supplier Question:

Which data systems or domains are expected to be in scope, such as student information systems, attendance, behavior, health/mental health, partner service data, or survey data? Will the supplier receive direct system access, data extracts, or only aggregated/report-level data?

UCF Answer:

Learning Circle is our current data management platform being used for this purpose. The data management platform contains attendance, behavior, and course grades from the school district. We do not typically have data from wellness providers or other partners. At the UCF Center, we do not typically have access to student survey data, but the sites may have access to additional data points specific to their school.

33) Supplier Question:

If proprietary tools or dashboards are proposed, does UCF have a preference for UCF-hosted, vendor-hosted, or hybrid models, and are there preferred licensing structures such as per-site, per-user, or enterprise pricing?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center for Community School prefers proprietary tools designed under this contract to be licensed to UCF Center for Community Schools.

34) Supplier Question:

Will all up to 50 CPS sites participate beginning in Year 1, or will there be a phased onboarding approach?

UCF Answer:

There will be a phased approach to all fifty sites.

35) Supplier Question:

For monthly coaching and technical assistance, what is the expected duration per session and preferred format, such as 1:1, small group, or cohort?

UCF Answer:

The supplier will set the time period, and we are open to adapting to group coaching as the pilot scales.

36) Supplier Question:

Is there an anticipated budget range or ceiling for this two-year engagement to help ensure alignment between proposed scope and available resources?

UCF Answer:

\$275,000 to negotiable per each year of the contract.

37) Supplier Question:

Does UCF expect a single fixed fee covering the full scope, or will modular or phased pricing approaches be considered if multiple awards are made?

UCF Answer:

See Section 3.2 Respondent/Offer Submittal Sections (page 30 of the ITN)

D. OVERALL PRICING

1. The proposal submitted in response to this ITN should enumerate a fixed fee.
2. The proposal should specify billing rates for the various personnel who will be involved in the activities being proposed.
3. The proposal should list any other categories of ancillary expenses that may be billed.

Note: The University will not reimburse travel, meals, or lodging expenses.

38) Supplier Question:

Agreement

- a) What specific licenses are required for this project as referenced in Section 2.15?

UCF Answer:

Any resulting agreement from this ITN will be governed by applicable Federal, State, and local laws, as well as UCF policies and procedures, including but not limited to procurement, contracting and ethics requirements. In addition, the contract will incorporate the terms and conditions included in this ITN and any negotiated provisions agreed upon during the ITN process. Supplier(s) are encouraged to review all solicitation documents, including referenced policies.

- b) What is the notification process for the automatic extension of the period described in Section 2.19?

UCF Answer:

Section 2.19 is the Force Majeure clause. The automatic renewal/extension clause is referenced in Section 2.21 (Contract Term). A resulting renewal/extension to the agreement (if any) will be mutually agreed upon by both parties. UCF will contact the authorized representative identified on page 1 of the ITN.

- c) Should the “Company’s Government Classification Code” referenced in Section 2.36(D) be interpreted as the NAICS code?

UCF Answer:

By way of this Addendum, Section 2.36(D) has been removed in its’ entirety from this ITN.

- d) Should the proposal strictly align with Section 3.0 requirements?

UCF Answer:

The proposal should, at minimum, align with Section 3.0.

39) Supplier Question:

Current state

- a) Are existing processes documented and measured?

UCF Answer:

Yes. The UCF Center for Community Schools monitors progress on a quarterly, annual, and five year basis.

- b) How many documents currently exist that outline the Community Partnership Schools (CPS) strategy?

UCF Answer:

The Community Partnership School model began in Florida and there are several book chapters that discuss the model and history. Community Partnership Schools are a model of the overarching community schooling strategy. Many resources exist that outline the community schooling strategy, pillars, and essential concepts. More information about the CPS model can be found on our website (<https://ccie.ucf.edu/communityschools/>), by reviewing our certification assessment standards which outline the components of the model, or in chapter 6 of this book: [The Community Schools Revolution | Building Partnerships, Transforming Lives, Advancing Democracy.](#)

- c) What is the current scope of continuous improvement efforts underway?

UCF Answer:

The quarterly, annual, and five year progress monitoring are all aligned and equipped with a comprehensive feedback system. Additionally, the UCF Center piloted a continuous improvement and progress monitoring initiative, this past fiscal year with 6 CPS sites.

- d) Are there existing continuous improvement methodologies or capabilities in place at UCF or CPS sites, or will this begin from a baseline?

UCF Answer:

There are methodologies in existence. The UCF Center for Community Schools employs an independent evaluator, deepening the progress monitoring methodologies and efficiency. Additionally, the UCF Center piloted a continuous improvement and progress monitoring initiative, similar to the scope of the ITN, this past fiscal year with 6 CPS sites.

- e) What project management capabilities currently exist at CPS schools and within the UCF Center for Community Schools?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center for Community Schools utilizes Microsoft suite as a primary toolkit for project management and efficient work. CPS sites have tools provided by their nonprofit and district partners.

- f) Are there established change management and project management capabilities at UCF or CPS schools that will support this effort?

UCF Answer:

Yes.

- g) Are there any existing AI governance or strategy that this project should align with?

UCF Answer:

All UCF Center for Community Schools programming aligns to the UCF Responsible AI Use at UCF: Ethical considerations.

- h) Has any type of CPS needs assessment and asset mapping been conducted so far? and if so can it be shared?

UCF Answer:

A deliverable for each of the Community Partnership Schools is to update a needs assessment every 3-5 years. This is a fundamental of the Community Partnership School model. For clarity, there is no needs assessment or asset map that covers the entire initiative, only those for individual sites.

40) Supplier Question:

- a) What is the current level of CPS data accuracy and centralization?

UCF Answer:

Each data source has its own level of confirmed accuracy and centralization. Student data received directly from the school districts has no room for error except that which exists when the data is entered. Student participation data in programs is dependent upon site staff to enter the data and enter it accurately. What is available and the level of accuracy will vary from site to site, however, the UCF Center does provide training and support on using the data management platform. Data coming from FDOE is similar to the data that comes from the school districts. Quarterly reporting data and other deliverables rely on site staff to enter counts accurately; however, the UCF Center employs a data verification process when numbers received seem questionable. Certification reports are written by UCF Center staff based on a series of components to the certification assessment (narrative, evidence documents, stakeholder surveys, site tour, and focus groups). These are the pieces of data to which we have direct access at the UCF Center. Data specific to the sites (such as school climate surveys) will vary by site in availability and accuracy. Some site directors will have additional data trackers required of them by their employer. The UCF Center does not have direct access to such trackers.

- b) How many data entities are anticipated (i.e., Leaders, Teachers, Students, Classrooms)?

UCF Answer:

School staff/administration, CPS staff, students, parents/caregivers, community members, core partners/providers

- c) How many data subjects are anticipated (i.e., Teachers, Students, Parents)?

UCF Answer:

There are approximately 45,000 students across the 50 school sites. The number of parents is likely 50-60,000 with approximately 29,000 unique households. The number of community members is unknown. Each site should have 4 core staff positions (some might have one additional), so approximately 200 CPS staff members. 2,400 teachers, 160 school administrators, and 2,100 support staff.

- d) How many data domains/subject areas are anticipated (i.e., teacher data, student data, classroom/subject data)?

UCF Answer:

Teacher/staff data may be available, but may or may not be used. Student data or school data are the most likely categories.

- e) How many data sources/types are anticipated (i.e., demographic, from the classroom, student scores)?

UCF Answer:

Student: Demographic, attendance, behavior, course grades, and program participation. Additional data fields could be obtained through special request such as FAST assessment scores, socioeconomic factors, or family data.

School: FDOE provides quite a bit of school wide data points via their Know Your School Portal website and additional fields are available upon request. CPS specific data includes certification assessment reports, quarterly reports, and other deliverables.

41) Supplier Question:

Metrics

- a) What are the key desired outcomes in terms of measurable KPIs, and what level of improvement is expected?

UCF Answer:

Key desired outcomes center on strengthening implementation quality, data-informed decision-making, cross-site collaboration, and long-term sustainability across participating CPS sites. Measurable KPIs are expected to include increased consistency and effectiveness of personalized coaching and technical assistance; regular participation in monthly coaching, train-the-trainer (TTT), and network learning activities; improved use of standardized data collection and continuous improvement tools; stronger implementation of data-driven planning and problem-solving practices; increased cross-site collaboration and dissemination of best practices; and enhanced capacity of CPS leaders and UCF CCS staff to independently support continuous improvement efforts over time.

Additional indicators may include completion and utilization of monthly service provision reports, annual needs assessments, quarterly updates, executive reporting, and adoption of tools, dashboards, and progress monitoring systems that support actionable insights. Success is also expected to include measurable growth in internal UCF CCS capacity through the TTT model, resulting in more consistent, scalable, and sustainable technical assistance across the statewide CPS network. While UCF is not prescribing fixed percentage improvement targets at this stage, respondents should propose realistic, measurable outcomes and benchmarks aligned with phased implementation and continuous improvement over the two-year engagement period.

42) Supplier Question:

People

- a) What is the approximate number of UCF personnel, CPS personnel, team members, client contacts, and other stakeholders?

UCF Answer:

The Technical Assistance team and Assessment and Evaluation teams will be most hands on with this contract and the personnel capacity will be evaluated ongoing. UCF personnel will be up to 10 staff members. Participating CPS personnel include up to 50 site directors and their regional nonprofit senior leaders.

Overall, the initiative represents approximately 200 core community school staff (4 per school), including one director per site across all 50 sites. There are approximately 45,000 students across the 50 school sites.

- b) Will existing employees participate in pre-implementation phases (part-time or full-time)? If so, how many?

UCF Answer:

Up to 10 UCF Center for Community School employees will be included in the train the trainer component. The employees are all full-time with departmental responsibilities.

- c) Is there an expectation of how many trainers will require training?

UCF Answer:

We anticipate up to 10 UCF Center for Community School staff to be trained on the progress monitoring system. The supplier will determine the number of employees required to conduct the contractual obligation.

- d) Will resources be required onsite at CPS locations, or will work be conducted virtually? Please provide an approximate percentage split between in-person and virtual engagement.

UCF Answer:

Roughly 90 % of the programming will occur virtually and roughly 10 percent will be conducted in-person. We will coordinate with CPS locations for any on-site activities, and costs for convening venue(s) will be covered by the UCF Center.

- e) Who will serve as the primary UCF counterparts and key stakeholders for this engagement?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center technical assistance team, CPS site directors, and nonprofit senior leadership.

- f) We understand this project may involve a broad range of stakeholders (e.g., UCF Center for Community Schools, technology teams, CPS administrators, students, families, and community partners). Could you further clarify the stakeholder landscape and the expected level of engagement (e.g., student/family level vs. leadership level)?

UCF Answer:

While the majority of the project's engagement will be with CPS site directors and UCF Center staff, each level of stakeholder mentioned is currently engaged in our work. The primary client for the UCF Center for Community Schools are the Non-Profits/CPS Site Directors, but the committee structure on the ground includes multiple levels of

stakeholders. To do the work of community schools well, this is the level of engagement required.

- g) Are you expecting dedicated coaches to be assigned to specific schools or can a pooled/shared coaching model be used?

UCF Answer:

A pooled/shared coaching model can be used.

- h) Will existing employees from CPS be involved in each phase and part of the Train-the-Trainer, Coaching, etc.? If not, what level of weekly access to staff can be expected?

UCF Answer:

UCF Center for Community Schools staff are the target audience of the train-the-trainer components. Once trained by the end of the contract, they will become the coaches to the sites to sustain the work.

- i) What existing Project Management, Process Mapping and Video conferencing capability software do you currently use and/or expect to use during this project?

UCF Answer:

We anticipate the utilization of Microsoft Suite, AirTable, Learning Circle, and additional software the supplier writes into their contract that align with UCF

43) Supplier Question:

Plan

- a) Are you asking for a balanced pricing model or cost-constrained model

UCF Answer:

We are seeking a balanced pricing model that is both cost-conscious and scalable, while still ensuring sufficient capacity and quality support to effectively (and eventually) serve all CPS sites. We are open to innovative approaches that maximize efficiency without compromising implementation quality or responsiveness to site needs.

- b) Is the level of customization intended to be highly standardized (all using the same tools, dashboards, and coaching), a 70/30 model with a standard core and meaningful customization by school, or highly customized for each school?

UCF Answer:

At this stage, we envision a model that includes a strong standardized core framework with flexibility for regional and site-specific adaptation. We anticipate common tools, processes, and implementation expectations across all sites, while allowing room for customization based on local context, community needs, district structures, and stages of implementation.

- c) What are the major milestones and expected timelines for this project?

UCF Answer:

Major milestones would likely include project planning and onboarding, assessment of current implementation structures and needs, development of staffing and technical assistance recommendations, pilot or phased implementation support, creation of sustainability and continuous improvement processes, and delivery of final recommendations and resources. We anticipate a phased approach over the two-year period, with opportunities for ongoing feedback and refinement.

- d) What is the expected timeline for delivering a best-practices playbook, and how will its success be evaluated?

UCF Answer:

We would anticipate development of a best-practices playbook during the course of the project, with a draft ideally available after the contract's first year and refinement/finalization occurring during year two based on implementation learning and stakeholder feedback. Success would be evaluated by the playbook's usability, adoption across stakeholders, alignment with CPS implementation goals, and evidence that it supports more consistent, effective implementation practices statewide.

- e) How many areas for CPS school improvement or new programs are you aiming to implement or improve in the 2-year time frame?

UCF Answer:

Rather than targeting a fixed number of improvement areas or new programs, our focus is on strengthening core implementation systems and supports across the UCF Center and CPS sites. Priorities may include coaching for areas such as partnership engagement, integrated student supports, sustainability planning, data use and continuous improvement, staffing structures, and cross-site collaboration. We expect proposals to help identify and prioritize the highest-impact opportunities within the two-year timeframe.

44) Supplier Question:

Scope

- a) What are the primary challenges currently faced within the CPS program?

UCF Answer:

The primary challenges across the CPS initiative include sustaining staffing capacity, navigating leadership turnover, ensuring consistency of implementation across diverse sites, strengthening data and continuous improvement systems, and supporting long-term sustainability. As the network has grown, there has also been an increased need for scalable technical assistance structures, stronger cross-site coordination, and clearer systems for sharing best practices and measuring impact.

- b) What factors have led to the decision to seek external support?

UCF Answer:

The decision to seek external support is driven by both the scale and complexity of supporting a growing statewide network of CPS sites and the opportunity to bring in additional expertise, capacity, and innovative thinking. We are particularly interested in identifying scalable models, operational efficiencies, and best practices that can strengthen implementation quality and long-term sustainability across all sites.

- c) What is the current team size managing this program, and what capabilities exist or are lacking?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center for Community Schools currently has an established team supporting CPS implementation across the state, with dedicated staff providing CPS technical assistance. While significant foundational capacity exists, continued growth of the network has highlighted the need for additional strategic infrastructure, specialized support, and

scalable systems to ensure consistent and high-quality coaching to support continuous improvement in implementation across all sites.

- d) How many CPS locations are in scope, and what improvement targets have been established?

UCF Answer:

The current scope includes approximately 50 CPS sites statewide. Improvement efforts are focused less on a single quantitative target and more on strengthening implementation quality, consistency, sustainability, cross-site collaboration, scalability, and measurable impact in areas aligned with the CPS model and local community needs.

- e) Is there a centralized PMO currently managing CPS programs or improvements?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center currently serves in a centralized coordination and support role that includes a dedicated technical assistance team serving as the PMO.

- f) If so, how effective has it been?

UCF Answer:

This structure has been effective in supporting program growth and statewide alignment, though additional refinement and scalable systems may be needed as the network expands.

- g) Will this engagement involve existing projects, new initiatives, or both?

UCF Answer:

This engagement would likely involve both existing implementation efforts and new initiatives. In addition to strengthening current systems and supports, we anticipate opportunities to develop new tools, frameworks, staffing models, and continuous improvement processes that enhance statewide implementation moving forward.

- h) Are risks currently tracked? If so, what are the most significant risks identified?

UCF Answer:

Risks are monitored on an ongoing basis through regular technical assistance, reporting, and stakeholder engagement processes. Key risks include staff and leadership turnover, inconsistent implementation fidelity across sites, sustainability and funding challenges, varying levels of district and partner capacity and engagement, data limitations, and the broader operational pressures facing schools and communities. Addressing these risks proactively through stronger systems, clearer guidance, and enhanced support structures is a major priority of this work.

45) Supplier Question:

Success

- a) How would success be defined for this project by both UCF (and its key stakeholder) and CPS Schools?

UCF Answer:

Success for this project would be defined by the development of a more scalable, sustainable, and consistent support structure that strengthens coaching, continuous improvement efforts, and implementation quality across all CPS sites while remaining responsive to local community needs. From the perspective of UCF Center and key stakeholders, success would include clearer statewide systems and processes, stronger

technical assistance infrastructure, improved cross-site collaboration, enhanced data and continuous improvement practices, increased sustainability capacity, and stronger alignment between districts, schools, and community partners. For CPS schools, success would likely be reflected in more responsive and effective support, clearer implementation guidance, stronger partnerships, reduced operational barriers, and improved capacity to sustain and deepen the CPS model over time in ways that positively impact students, families, and communities.

- b) Our objective is to build sustainable capabilities across people, processes, and technology. Which specific capabilities would you like to see enhanced in each of these areas?

UCF Answer:

In terms of sustainable capability-building, we would like to see enhancements across people, processes, and technology. For people, this includes stronger staffing structures, leadership development, coaching and technical assistance capacity, and clearer role specialization. For processes, priorities include standardized implementation frameworks, continuous improvement systems, sustainability planning, partnership coordination, communication protocols, and scalable operational practices. For technology, we are interested in tools and systems that improve data collection and visualization, reporting, collaboration, resource sharing, implementation monitoring, and knowledge management across the statewide CPS network.

46) Supplier Question:

Technology

- a) What are the system environment boundaries for this engagement?

UCF Answer:

The system environment for this engagement will primarily involve the statewide CPS support infrastructure managed by the UCF Center for Community Schools, including technical assistance systems, reporting and evaluation processes, communication and collaboration structures, and tools used to support implementation across CPS sites and partners. The engagement should consider both centralized statewide coordination needs and the varying regional and local systems and capacities of individual nonprofits and schools.

- b) Are there preferred cloud platforms or tools that should be utilized—or avoided?

UCF Answer:

At this time, there are no required cloud platforms or mandated technology solutions. We are open to recommendations that prioritize scalability, usability, accessibility, security, and long-term sustainability. Preference should be given to solutions that can integrate well with commonly used higher education, district, and nonprofit collaboration environments and that minimize unnecessary complexity or cost.

- c) Are there documents describing existing data collection, storage, and usage practices?

UCF Answer:

Yes, there are existing documents and processes related to data collection, reporting, implementation monitoring, and program evaluation that can be shared during the engagement. These materials will help provide context around current practices, requirements, and areas for improvement.

- d) Is there an existing platform for project documentation and collaboration, or would tools such as Google Drive be acceptable?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center currently utilizes a combination of existing collaboration and document-sharing tools. Platforms such as Google Drive and other widely accessible collaboration tools may be acceptable, provided they support efficient coordination, version control, accessibility, and secure information sharing among stakeholders.

- e) Are we building from scratch, using existing tools/platforms, or standardizing and improving usage of existing tools?

UCF Answer:

This work is not intended to build an entirely new system from scratch. Instead, the goal is to assess, strengthen, streamline, and better integrate existing tools, processes, and structures while identifying opportunities for standardization, improved scalability, and strategic enhancements where needed. We are open to thoughtful recommendations regarding where new tools or systems may add value.

47) Supplier Question:

Can UCF clarify whether suppliers will retain ownership of pre-existing tools, templates, materials, and methodologies used in performance, with UCF receiving a license to use such materials solely as incorporated into the resulting deliverables?

UCF Answer:

UCF recognizes that suppliers may retain ownership of pre-existing proprietary tools, templates, methodologies, and materials developed independently of this engagement. However, UCF would require sufficient rights to use, reproduce, modify, maintain, and support any deliverables produced under the project, including any incorporated materials necessary for their intended use. Specific intellectual property ownership, licensing, and usage rights will be subject to review and negotiation through UCF's contracting and procurement processes.

48) Supplier Question:

Can UCF clarify expectations regarding publication, external presentation, or other public dissemination of findings or materials developed under this project, including whether such activities may be permitted with prior written approval?

UCF Answer:

Such activities are not permitted without prior approval. Data obtained through the process of working for the UCF Center may not be used without the expressly written consent of the UCF Center for Community Schools.

49) Supplier Question:

Can UCF confirm whether offerors may submit a redacted version of the proposal for public release, and provide any guidance on format or requirements for identifying proprietary or confidential information under Florida public records law?

UCF Answer:

Yes.

50) Supplier Question:

Can UCF confirm whether any additional data use, data sharing, privacy, or information security agreements will be required beyond the base contract?

UCF Answer:

Data sharing agreements may be necessary to provide access to student level data to the vendor. No identified student data will be shared with the vendor. All data use must comply with FERPA requirements.

51) Supplier Question:

Can UCF confirm whether the insurance requirements, including advance notice of cancellation provisions, may be satisfied through standard carrier-issued policies and certificates, or whether UCF requires specific endorsement language beyond what is commercially available from the supplier's insurance carriers?

UCF Answer:

Yes, insurance requirements can be met using standard carrier-issues policies and certificates.

52) Supplier Question:

Can UCF clarify whether Level I or Level II background checks are anticipated for supplier personnel under this engagement, and whether any associated requirements should be factored into the proposed fixed fee?

UCF Answer:

These should be unnecessary as the vendor will not be in contact with students.

53) Supplier Question:

Can UCF clarify which UCF policies are expected to apply to the awarded supplier's performance under this engagement, including whether any specific data security, digital accessibility, youth protection, travel, or communications/media policies will be incorporated into the final contract?

UCF Answer:

Yes. The awarded supplier will be expected to comply with all applicable University of Central Florida (UCF) policies and procedures as incorporated into the final contract, as well as any federal, state, or grant-related requirements that govern the CPS grant program.

54) Supplier Question:

Can UCF confirm whether the awarded supplier may invoice on an agreed monthly, milestone, or deliverable-based schedule during the contract term, notwithstanding the statement that final payment will not be made until after contract completion unless otherwise agreed?

UCF Answer:

The awarded supplier may invoice based on an agreed-upon payment structure that is tied to milestones and/or deliverables, which may be structured on a monthly, phased, or hybrid basis as defined in the final contract.

While the ITN language indicates that final payment may be withheld until contract completion unless otherwise agreed, UCF anticipates establishing a deliverables-based payment schedule during contract negotiation. This would allow for periodic invoicing

aligned to the completion and acceptance of defined milestones, phases, or outputs, rather than requiring all payment to occur at the end of the engagement.

55) Supplier Question:

Scope & Participation

- a) Of the ~50 sites, how many individuals per site will participate in capacity-building activities?

UCF Answer:

1 key personnel, the CPS Site Director

- b) How many individuals will serve as trainers, and how are they distributed across sites?

UCF Answer:

Up to 10 UCF Center staff members. There is a technical assistance lead for each of the 4 UCF Center's CPS regions, plus assessment and evaluation staff members.

- c) Are all 50 sites expected to engage equally, or is there a tiered/priority structure?

UCF Answer:

All 50 CPS sites are expected to be within scope over the life of the contract, but not all sites will engage equally or simultaneously. A tiered, phased approach is anticipated, with engagement intensity based on readiness, implementation maturity, and identified needs. Early cohorts will likely receive more intensive support, with additional sites onboarded and supported as capacity and systems scale, with UCF technical assistance program managers carrying the work forward once trained and supporting the field.

- d) What is the anticipated level of effort per site (light-touch vs. intensive support)?

UCF Answer:

The anticipated level of effort will vary by tier. Some sites will require intensive coaching and technical assistance, particularly in early implementation phases or during transition periods. Others with more established implementation may receive lighter-touch, advisory, or maintenance-level support, focused on refinement, data use, and sustainability. The model is intended to be adaptive and responsive over time, with support intensity decreasing or shifting as site capacity increases.

56) Supplier Question:

Train-the-Trainer Model

- a) Who are the intended trainers (UCF staff, site staff, regional leads)?

UCF Answer:

UCF Center Technical Assistance and Assessment & Evaluation staff.

- b) What level of responsibility will trainers have (one-time delivery vs. ongoing facilitation)?

UCF Answer:

Ongoing facilitation

- c) Will trainers be expected to continue beyond the project period?

UCF Answer:

Yes

- d) What structures exist (or need to be built) to support trainer quality and consistency?

UCF Answer:

Currently, UCF supports trainer quality and consistency through a combination of internal technical assistance staff and the UCF Center's virtual Training Academy, which serves as a centralized hub for CPS implementation support. The virtual Training Academy includes standardized training modules, instructional videos, templates, tools, and curated resources that help ensure a common baseline of understanding and practice across CPS sites and support more consistent onboarding and professional development.

These existing structures provide an important foundation for consistency; however, as the CPS network has grown, there is a continued need to strengthen how these resources are used, developed, and reinforced across trainers and regions. In particular, there is opportunity to better align live technical assistance and coaching with the virtual Training Academy content, ensuring consistent messaging, application, and fidelity of the CPS model across all sites.

57) Supplier Question:

Evaluation Expectations

- a) Is the focus primarily formative (learning/improvement) or summative (outcomes/impact)?

UCF Answer:

The focus is primarily formative, with a strong emphasis on learning, continuous improvement, and building system-wide capacity to use data effectively across CPS sites. The intent is to ensure that data is used not only to report results, but more importantly to strengthen implementation and improve outcomes over time across the CPS network.

- b) Are there predefined metrics, or is the evaluator expected to co-develop them?

UCF Answer:

Metrics would be co-developed.

- c) How much standardization is required across sites vs. flexibility for local context?

UCF Answer:

A mix of both. At the UCF Center we understand the context-dependent nature of our work and that sites will not all be able to do everything the same way. This work requires some flexibility for sites to meet the needs of their students and communities. However, there must be enough standardization that it can be taught effectively and the method applied for any school site.

58) Supplier Question:

Data Access & Quality

- a) What data systems are currently in place across sites?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center provides sites with access to the Learning Circle data management platform. It houses student level data received from the school district and allows sites to track student participation in programs, supports, and events. The platform is used by many sites, but it is not yet being used by all. Quarterly reporting is also completed through this same data management platform to track deliverables separately from student data.

indicators. Each non-profit has their own data reporting systems, but the UCF Center does not have access to those systems.

- b) Will we have direct access to raw data, or rely on site-reported summaries?

UCF Answer:

Quarterly reports and deliverables typically consist of site-reported summaries and aggregate data.

- c) What is the current level of data quality and consistency across sites?

UCF Answer:

Each data source has its own level of confirmed accuracy and centralization. Student data received directly from the school districts has no room for error except that which exists when the data is entered. Student participation data in programs is dependent upon site staff to enter the data and enter it accurately. What is available and the level of accuracy will vary from site to site, however, the UCF Center does provide training and support on using the data management platform. Data coming from FDOE is similar to the data that comes from the school districts. Quarterly reporting data and other deliverables rely on site staff to enter counts accurately; however, the UCF Center employs a data verification process when numbers received seem questionable. Certification reports are written by UCF Center staff based on a series of components to the certification assessment (narrative, evidence documents, stakeholder surveys, site tour, and focus groups). These are the pieces of data to which we have direct access at the UCF Center. Data specific to the sites (such as school climate surveys) will vary by site in availability and accuracy. Some site directors will have additional data trackers required of them by their employer. The UCF Center does not have direct access to such trackers.

59) Supplier Question:

Capacity Building Goals

- a) What baseline data capacity do participating organizations currently have?

UCF Answer:

Sites are provided with a data management platform from the UCF Center for Community Schools. If the district has signed a data-sharing agreement, then the sites are able to use the data management platform. This platform provides them with student data updated by the school district daily and allows for detailed tracking of student participation in programs, support, and events. If the site is unable to use the provided data management platform, their data tracking is dependent upon what their non-profit or school district has provided for them to use.

- b) What specific competencies are expected to improve?

UCF Answer:

- Demonstrate proficiency in evidence-based coaching strategies to coach and support UCF Center and through a train-the-trainer model.
- Coach sites to manage, interpret, and apply data through dynamic dashboards to support ongoing evaluation and continuous improvement.
- Facilitate effective virtual individual and group coaching sessions that drive reflection, accountability, and goal attainment.

- Lead in-person, data-informed large-group sessions that translate evidence into actionable practice.
- TtT and End User
- Enable site level clients to develop clear, measurable SMART goals aligned to program priorities.
- Coach the UCF Center and site level clients to use effective tools and measures to assess progress toward identified goals.
- Ensure site level clients are coached in using data as the primary driver of decision-making at all levels.
- Cultivate a shift among site level clients from passion- and output-driven work to outcomes-focused, data-driven strategies.
- Strengthen intentionality among site level clients in program design, implementation, and continuous refinement.

c) Is there an expectation for measurable change in data practices over time?

UCF Answer:

Ultimately, yes. Typically, when people gain a better understanding of data and the value of it, they are more likely to do the steps necessary to track data. We would expect them to better understand the data, how it applies to their work, and how they can use the findings.

60) Supplier Question:

Logistics & Resourcing

a) What is the total budget and how is it allocated (evaluation vs. capacity building vs. TTT)?

UCF Answer:

- Total budget: The anticipated budget is \$275,000 per year (negotiable). Proposals should be structured within this annual amount and clearly show how resources are allocated across key workstreams.
- Budget allocation: While no fixed split is required, the budget should be transparently organized across evaluation, capacity building/technical assistance, and the TTT model, with an emphasis on strengthening long-term internal UCF capacity.

b) What is the project timeline and key milestones?

UCF Answer:

Timeline and milestones: The engagement is expected to span approximately two years in a phased approach, including onboarding and assessment, tool and framework development, phased implementation of technical assistance and coaching, rollout of the TTT model, delivery of a best-practices playbook, and scaling support across up to 50 CPS sites.

c) Are there internal UCF staff or partners supporting coordination across sites?

UCF Answer:

Internal UCF capacity: Yes—UCF has existing regional technical assistance staff, program leadership, and a virtual training academy that supports CPS implementation. The selected supplier will work closely with these teams to build capacity, enhance systems, and support coordinated statewide implementation.

61) Supplier Question:

Success Criteria

- a) What does success look like for UCF at the end of this engagement?

UCF Answer:

Overall, success will be defined not only by improved continuous improvement structures across CPS sites, but by UCF's strengthened internal capacity to independently sustain, scale, and support the CPS network going forward.

- b) How will the effectiveness of the evaluation and capacity-building effort—including the TTT model—be assessed?

UCF Answer:

Through implementation, capacity-building, and sustainability outcomes. Key measures may include improved data collection and continuous improvement practices, stronger use of data for decision-making, participation in coaching and TTT activities, increased consistency and quality of technical assistance, and strengthened internal capacity of UCF CCS staff and CPS leaders to independently support implementation efforts. Effectiveness will also be measured by the successful adoption and cross-site implementation of tools, resources, and practices, including use of the virtual Training Academy and evidence of sustained learning and support beyond the engagement period.

62) Supplier Question:

Does UCF have an anticipated budget range or not-to-exceed amount for this contract, either overall or annually, that proposers should use to calibrate scope, staffing, and pricing assumptions?

UCF Answer:

\$275,000 per year (negotiable)

63) Supplier Question:

Is UCF open to a phased implementation (e.g., phased onboarding of sites in Year 1 to ensure quality before full scale?)

UCF Answer:

Yes

64) Supplier Question:

Should the vendor assume all 50 sites participate simultaneously, or will participation vary over time?

UCF Answer:

Participation should be assumed to vary over time rather than all 50 CPS sites engaging simultaneously from contract start.

UCF anticipates a phased and differentiated rollout model, where sites are onboarded based on readiness, implementation stage, and priority needs. This means that at any given point during the engagement, the number of actively engaged sites may fluctuate as additional schools are added and support intensity shifts across cohorts.

65) Supplier Question:

Beyond the bi-annual convenings and annual summits, should proposers assume that all monthly site-level coaching are virtual?

UCF Answer:

Yes

66) Supplier Question:

The ITN references bi-annual in-person convenings with CPS networks but does not specify expected size or participant composition. Can UCF clarify the anticipated number of participants per convening and which roles (e.g., CPS directors, principals, partners, CCS staff) are expected to attend?

UCF Answer:

At this stage, UCF envisions the bi-annual in-person convenings as cohort-wide gatherings, based on implementation phase, designed to engage a broad CPS stakeholder community. The exact size and composition may vary depending on the specific convening focus and agenda.

67) Supplier Question:

How many Florida CPS networks are there?

UCF Answer:

There are 50 sites in 22 districts. All are recipients of a grant through the UCF Center for Community Schools. The Center organizes the sites by region with 4 established regions.

68) Supplier Question:

Can respondents propose combining some or all CPS network in-person convenings?

UCF Answer:

Ultimately, the expectation is not a rigid convening structure, but a thoughtfully designed engagement model that maximizes value for participants while remaining scalable and aligned to CPS objectives.

69) Supplier Question:

Are there expectations to differentiate support intensity across sites based on need or maturity?

UCF Answer:

Given the diversity of CPS sites across the state, a uniform support model is not expected to be effective or efficient. Instead, respondents should propose a tiered or adaptive technical assistance approach that allows for varying levels of intensity and engagement over time. This may include higher-touch coaching and more frequent engagement for early-stage or higher-need sites, and more advisory, targeted, or maintenance-level support for sites that demonstrate greater maturity and implementation stability.

Differentiation should be informed by clear criteria or indicators (e.g., readiness assessments, implementation fidelity, data capacity, leadership stability, or partnership strength), and should be designed to evolve as sites progress over time. The intent is to ensure that resources are allocated strategically, supporting stronger outcomes while building long-term site capacity and sustainability across the full CPS network.

70) Supplier Question:

The ITN references annual data-informed summits with CPS directors and principals as distinct from the bi-annual in-person convenings, but does not specify how their purpose or audience should differ. Can UCF clarify the intended goals of the annual summits and how they should differ in focus, format, and participants from the bi-annual convenings?

UCF Answer:

All UCF Center for Community School convenings are differentiated and adaptable. With this roll out, there could be a combination of collaborative convenings for learning exchanges as well as targeted data informed summits. We will also strategize when it is appropriate for the data informed summit to occur, on the front end or the back end of the collaborative summits.

71) Supplier Question:

In 2.42, the ITN states “The Respondent shall not under this ITN or any resulting contract charge UCF for any travel expenses, meals, lodging without UCF’s prior written approval.” In 3.2.D., the ITN states “The University will not reimburse travel, meals, or lodging expenses.” Is the respondent expected to estimate these expenses in its proposal? If the contract is awarded, when is the contracted entity expected to request and receive approval?

UCF Answer:

Yes—respondents should estimate all anticipated travel, meals, and lodging expenses within their proposal and include them in the fixed-fee pricing.

The intent of Sections 2.42 and 3.2.D is that these costs will not be separately reimbursed or billed outside of the contract price. Instead, they should be fully incorporated into the overall proposed budget, with clear assumptions documented (e.g., number of in-person convenings, site visits, staffing participation, travel frequency, and duration).

Regarding approval, the reference to “prior written approval” is intended to govern specific, unanticipated, or out-of-scope travel requests, rather than routine, pre-planned project travel that is already included in the fixed fee. If any travel needs arise beyond what is explicitly outlined in the approved scope or assumptions, the contracted entity would be expected to seek written approval from UCF **before** incurring those additional costs.

72) Supplier Question:

Pages 6–7 | Section 1.1 — Statement of Objective / Required Services The ITN references support for "up to 50 CPS sites." Should Respondents assume all 50 sites will be active at contract start, or does UCF anticipate a phased rollout across the two-year term? If phased, can UCF provide the anticipated number of sites by phase or year?

UCF Answer:

UCF anticipates a phased rollout across the two-year term, rather than all 50 CPS sites being fully active at contract start.

At contract initiation, respondents should assume an initial cohort of sites will engage first based on readiness, current implementation stage, and priority needs. Additional sites will then be onboarded in structured phases over time as capacity, tools, and technical assistance structures are refined and scaled.

73) Supplier Question:

Page 6 | Section 1.1 — Personalized Coaching and Technical Assistance Can UCF clarify the expected coaching model across participating CPS sites, including anticipated coach-to-site ratio, baseline cadence, duration of coaching sessions, and whether coaching intensity should vary by site readiness, maturity, or context?

UCF Answer:

In partnership with the UCF Center, sites are to be provided coaching in adaptable forms, such as 1:1, small group, etc. based on needs.

74) Supplier Question:

Page 7 | Section 1.1 — In-Person Convenings / Annual Summits For the bi-annual in-person convenings and annual data-informed summits, can UCF clarify the expected location(s), participant groups, estimated attendance, duration, and whether Supplier team travel should be included in the fixed fee?

UCF Answer:

At this stage, the bi-annual in-person convenings and annual data-informed summits are expected to be held within Florida, with specific locations to be determined in coordination with UCF based on accessibility, cost-effectiveness, and participation needs. Respondents should assume that convenings will be centrally accessible to CPS stakeholders across the state, but exact host sites have not yet been finalized.

Participant groups are expected to include representatives from CPS school sites and UCF CCS leadership and technical assistance staff. Attendance will vary by event, but respondents should plan for a statewide convening model that accommodates broad representation across the CPS network.

Each convening is anticipated to be a full-day in-person event, with the annual data-informed summit potentially extending into a multi-day format depending on agenda design and stakeholder engagement needs. Final structure and duration may be refined in collaboration with the selected supplier.

Supplier team participation in all convenings and summits should be assumed as part of the scope, and all associated travel, lodging, and per diem costs should be included within the fixed-fee proposal. Respondents should plan accordingly for full engagement of key project staff in facilitation, technical assistance, and presentation activities at these events.

75) Supplier Question:

Pages 24, 30 | Sections 2.42 / 3.2.D — Travel Expenses / Overall Pricing Section 2.42 states that travel, meals, and lodging require prior written approval, while Section 3.2.D notes the University will not reimburse travel, meals, or lodging expenses. Should Respondents include all anticipated travel costs in the fixed-fee price, including travel for convenings, summits, onsite coaching, or stakeholder meetings?

UCF Answer:

Yes—respondents should include all anticipated travel costs within the fixed-fee price.

For purposes of this ITN, travel is considered an embedded component of delivering the scope of work, including participation in bi-annual convenings, annual summits, onsite coaching, technical assistance visits, and stakeholder engagement meetings. As noted in Section 3.2.D, separate reimbursement for travel, meals, or lodging will not be provided.

Accordingly, proposals should fully load all expected travel-related expenses into the fixed fee and clearly describe any assumptions used in estimating those costs (e.g., number of in-person events, staffing levels attending, travel frequency, and geographic considerations). This approach ensures transparency, cost predictability, and alignment with the requirement that travel not be billed separately or reimbursed outside of the contract price.

76) Supplier Question:

Page 6 | Section 1.1 — Data Collection and Continuous Improvement Tools Can UCF describe the current data environment across CPS sites, including existing systems, tools, dashboards, reporting processes, teams currently responsible for data management, and any variation across schools, districts, or partners?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center utilizes a data management platform called Learning Circle. Data-sharing agreements have been established with the majority of school districts in which there are community school sites associated with UCF. Data from each school district feeds into the Learning Circle platform nightly which includes attendance, behavior, and course grade records for each student. Sites can then track student participation in programs, supports, and events in the platform. Not all sites are entering participation data, but many are and the UCF Center continues to train and encourage sites to enter the data. Learning Circle has built and continues to build reports to demonstrate impact. (District data uploaded daily; student participation data varies based on site entry of information). Learning Circle is “live,” so data is available as soon as it is entered into the platform.

Program and service data is also reported by the sites quarterly as part of their quarterly reporting deliverable. These numbers are reported in aggregate. (Quarterly reports are quarterly; other deliverables are annual). These reports would be available after being submitted and approved, approximately 2 months following the end of the quarter.

The UCF Center has a data sharing agreement with Florida Department of Education (FDOE) allowing us to enhance student data records with additional information from the Department when needed. Files received from FDOE are deidentified. (when obtained from FDOE website or requested from FDOE) Data points from FDOE are available at different times in the year, dependent upon FDOE data processes and publishing.

At the site level, the director or their staff are often responsible for data entry. The UCF Center for Community Schools has a small data team but does not take on the responsibility of data entry or site level evaluations. Data collection and knowledge around data topics will likely vary significantly by site, district, implementation year, or other factors.

Wellness data is typically tracked by the wellness partner, but that is not data that is accessible to UCF, The district also tracks data that is beyond what is available in Learning Circle.

77) Supplier Question:

Pages 6, 28 | Sections 1.1 / 2.57 — Data Collection Tools / Secure Handling of UCF Data What categories of data should Respondents assume may be in scope for collection, analysis, dashboarding, or reporting, such as student academic data, attendance, behavior, family engagement, service utilization, partner services, health-related data, or qualitative site data?

UCF Answer:

Individual student data (demographics, attendance, behavior, course grades), student participation data in programs, aggregate service data, aggregate family engagement numbers, volunteer hours, mentoring hours, etc. It is unlikely that qualitative data will be available unless collected by an individual site. Health data is often not available beyond that a student attended unless the healthcare provider is willing to provide that data to the CPS site.

78) Supplier Question:

Page 28 | Sections 2.52 / 2.57 — FERPA / Secure Handling of UCF Data Are existing data-sharing agreements, security protocols, and access processes already in place across UCF, districts, CPS sites, and community partners, or should Respondents account for support in defining data governance and access workflows?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center for Community Schools has data sharing agreements with most of the school districts and with Florida Department of Education. Learning Circle employs substantive security procedures and adheres to all FERPA requirements. No identified student data is collected or held outside of Learning Circle by the UCF Center or its contractors/vendors. Security procedures for identified student data are clearly outlined in Florida statutes. Each district has slightly different rules for how they share data.

79) Supplier Question:

Page 7 | Section 1.1 — Monthly Reports / Annual Needs Assessments / Executive Reporting Can UCF clarify the expected reporting requirements, including preferred templates, required metrics, reporting audience, and whether baseline data will be available at contract start?

UCF Answer:

At this stage, UCF expects respondents to propose a structured reporting approach that aligns with the overall goals of the CPS model and supports both program-level oversight and site-level continuous improvement.

Reporting requirements are expected to include a combination of monthly progress updates, annual or periodic needs assessment summaries (as applicable by phase), and executive-level reporting products designed to inform leadership decision-making across UCF, districts, and key stakeholders. However, we do not have a single prescribed reporting template at this time. Respondents are encouraged to propose clear, user-friendly formats that emphasize actionable insights, trend analysis, implementation progress, and outcome alignment rather than purely descriptive reporting.

80) Supplier Question:

Page 6 | Section 1.1 — Customized, School-Specific Support To inform a differentiated support model, can UCF share whether site-level readiness data, maturity indicators, performance benchmarks, or prior needs assessments are currently available across CPS sites?

UCF Answer:

Yes. UCF does have existing site-level information that can inform implementation planning and model alignment, though the data varies in depth and consistency across CPS sites.

Across the network, there are multiple sources of relevant information that may include prior needs assessments, implementation documentation, partnership inventories, progress monitoring artifacts, and site-reported data used for technical assistance and reporting purposes. In addition, some sites have engaged in more structured readiness or planning processes than others, resulting in varying levels of maturity indicators and baseline documentation.

At the system level, UCF has developed and utilized internal tools and frameworks to assess implementation progress and support continuous improvement, though these have evolved over time and are not always uniformly applied across all sites. As a result, there is not a single standardized statewide dataset that fully captures readiness, maturity, and performance benchmarks in a consistent way across all 50 CPS sites.

81) Supplier Question:

Page 8 | Section 1.3 — UCF Environment Given the collaborative partnership model across UCF staff, CPS Directors, principals, nonprofit partners, districts, healthcare agencies, higher education partners, and community-based organizations, which stakeholder groups should the Supplier expect to engage directly through coaching, data reviews, convenings, onsite meetings, or continuous improvement activities?

UCF Answer:

Understanding this will inform the appropriate mix of coaching, technical, and facilitation resources in our response.

UCF Center technical assistance staff (up to 10), CPS site directors, (50) and nonprofit senior leadership (6-8).

82) Supplier Question:

Is there a logic model guiding the work? Does UCF have a theory of action, results framework, logic model, or existing continuous improvement framework that proposers should align to?

UCF Answer:

Respondents should assume alignment with an existing CPS model and continuous improvement orientation, while also having space—and being encouraged—to help refine and strengthen the overall results framework as part of the engagement.

83) Supplier Question:

What tools and rubrics do they use for their certification process?

UCF Answer:

The certification assessment tool consists of 12 standards. Each standard has fundamental practices (“must haves”) and overall indicators (50% of total possible points are required). The certification process and assessment tool were developed by UCF Center staff.

84) Supplier Question:

Is there a requested budget format and contract type?

UCF Answer:

Respondents may use their own budget format, provided it clearly and transparently aligns with the requirements outlined in the ITN (including fixed fee, personnel billing rates, and ancillary expenses). The format should be sufficiently detailed to support evaluation and should clearly show how costs map to scope, deliverables, and phases of work.

While there is flexibility in presentation format, clarity, traceability of costs, and alignment with deliverables-based execution will be important for evaluation and contracting purposes.

85) Supplier Question:

Is there a maximum total budget or budget range that can be used to inform the proposal?

UCF Answer:

\$275,000 per year (negotiable)

86) Supplier Question:

Are there particular measurable outcomes that should be the focus of the work?

UCF Answer:

Yes. While we are intentionally open to innovative approaches and do not want to over-prescribe a narrow set of outputs, there are several core outcome areas that should guide the work and be measurable over the course of the engagement.

At a high level, success should reflect strengthened implementation quality and consistency across CPS sites, improved alignment and functioning of the CPS model, stronger systems for knowledge sharing and replication of best practices, and strengthened data use for continuous improvement.

87) Supplier Question:

Is there an expectation for how many Community Partnership Schools will participate and when? All 50?

UCF Answer:

The expectation is that the full portfolio of up to 50 Community Partnership Schools (CPS) is within scope over the life of the contract; however, participation will be phased rather than simultaneous.

We anticipate an initial cohort of schools engaging earlier in the process based on readiness, current stage of implementation, and priority needs, with additional sites brought in over time through a structured onboarding and scaling plan. This phased approach is intended to ensure high-quality implementation support, effective use of resources, and the ability to refine tools and approaches before full statewide rollout.

Respondents should therefore design their approach to accommodate both early adopters and later-phase participants, with clear assumptions about how engagement will scale across all 50 sites and how support intensity may evolve over time.

88) Supplier Question:

What common data are currently collected among the Community Partnership Schools?
How frequently are the data collected/update

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center utilizes a data management platform called Learning Circle. Data-sharing agreements have been established with the majority of school districts in which there are community school sites associated with UCF. Data from each school district feeds into the Learning Circle platform nightly which includes attendance, behavior, and course grade records for each student. Sites can then track student participation in programs, supports, and events in the platform. Not all sites are entering participation data, but many are and the UCF Center continues to train and encourage sites to enter the data. Learning Circle has built and continues to build reports to demonstrate impact. (District data uploaded daily; student participation data varies based on site entry of information). Learning Circle is “live” so data is available as soon as it is entered into the platform.

Program and service data is also reported by the sites quarterly as part of their quarterly reporting deliverable. These numbers are reported in aggregate. (Quarterly reports are quarterly; other deliverables are annual). These reports would be available after being submitted and approved, approximately 2 months following the end of the quarter.

The UCF Center has a data sharing agreement with Florida Department of Education (FDOE) allowing us to enhance student data records with additional information from the Department when needed. Files received from FDOE are deidentified. (when obtained from FDOE website or requested from FDOE) Data points from FDOE are available at different times in the year, dependent upon FDOE data processes and publishing.

89) Supplier Question:

Is there a preference for a Florida-based supplier?

UCF Answer:

No

90) Supplier Question:

Insurance Timing – Section 2.20, Pages 17–19

Section 2.20 states that proof of insurance shall be delivered within fifteen (15) days of the tentative award date. Please confirm that certificates of insurance are not required at the time of proposal submission and may be provided after tentative award.

UCF Answer:

Yes, this is correct.

91) Supplier Question:

Subcontractor Insurance – Section 2.20 and Section 2.33, Pages 17–19 and 21–22

If the prime respondent uses subcontractors for technical/data systems support, are subcontractors required to carry their own insurance coverage, or is coverage under the prime respondent sufficient?

UCF Answer:

The university requires both the prime contractor and all subcontractor(s) to maintain independent insurance coverage to ensure clear lines of recovery. To waive the requirement for the subcontractor(s) to have coverage, the prime contractor would need to contractually agree to assume vicarious liability for the subcontractor's acts or omissions. This can be done via a contract addendum.

92) Supplier Question:

Subcontractor Registration – Section 2.15 and Section 2.33, Pages 14 and 21–22

Section 2.15 notes that subcontractors must be registered with the State of Florida in accordance with applicable statutes. Please confirm whether all subcontractors must be registered to do business in Florida prior to proposal submission, or only prior to award/contract performance.

UCF Answer:

Prior to Award/Contract Performance.

93) Supplier Question:

Expected Data Access – Section 1.1 and Section 1.3, Pages 6–8

The ITN references data collection tools, progress monitoring, dashboards, and data-rich environments. Will the selected supplier be expected to access existing UCF/school data systems directly, or should respondents propose a separate data collection and reporting approach?

UCF Answer:

The selected supplier should anticipate working within and alongside existing UCF and district/school data systems rather than replacing them with a fully separate standalone system. Where feasible, respondents are encouraged to propose approaches that leverage, integrate with, and enhance current data collection tools, progress monitoring processes, and reporting structures used across CPS sites.

94) Supplier Question:

Existing Data Sources – Section 1.3, Page 8

Can UCF provide examples of the types of student, family, program, or service data sources currently available across CPS sites?

UCF Answer:

Yes. The UCF Center utilizes a data management platform called [Learning Circle](#). Data-sharing agreements have been established with the majority of school districts in which there are community school sites associated with UCF. Data from each school district feeds into the Learning Circle platform nightly which includes attendance, behavior, and course grade records for each student. Sites can then track student participation in programs, supports, and events in the platform. Not all sites are entering participation data, but many

are and the UCF Center continues to train and encourage sites to enter the data. Learning Circle has built and continues to build reports to demonstrate impact. (District data uploaded daily; student participation data varies based on site entry of information). Learning Circle is “live,” so data is available as soon as it is entered into the platform.

Program and service data is also reported by the sites quarterly as part of their quarterly reporting deliverable. These numbers are reported in aggregate. (Quarterly reports are quarterly; other deliverables are annual). These reports would be available after being submitted and approved, approximately 2 months following the end of the quarter.

The UCF Center has a data sharing agreement with Florida Department of Education (FDOE) allowing us to enhance student data records with additional information from the Department when needed. Files received from FDOE are deidentified. (when obtained from FDOE website or requested from FDOE) Data points from FDOE are available at different times in the year, dependent upon FDOE data processes and publishing.

Student: Demographic, attendance, behavior, course grades, and program participation. Additional data fields could be obtained through special request such as FAST assessment scores, socioeconomic factors, or family data. School: FDOE provides quite a bit of school wide data points via their Know Your School Portal website and additional fields are available upon request. CPS specific data includes certification assessment reports, quarterly reports, and other deliverables.

95) Supplier Question:

Dashboard Expectations – Section 1.1, Page 6

Should respondents propose a fully developed dashboard/platform as part of the fixed fee, or may the proposal include a phased approach beginning with assessment, tool design, and implementation planning?

UCF Answer:

While a fully realized end-state dashboard is expected within the scope of the engagement, we do not expect it to be delivered immediately. Instead, proposals should clearly describe how development will evolve over time, how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the process, and how the solution will integrate with or enhance existing UCF systems and technical assistance structures.

96) Supplier Question:

Number of Sites – Section 1.1, Page 6

The ITN references support for up to 50 CPS sites. Should pricing assume all 50 sites from the beginning of the contract, or may respondents propose scalable pricing based on phased site participation?

UCF Answer:

Pricing should be designed with a phased implementation approach rather than assuming all 50 CPS sites are fully engaged from the outset. Respondents are encouraged to propose an innovative, scalable model that reflects staged onboarding and varying levels of support based on site readiness, capacity, and implementation phase.

We are particularly interested in approaches that leverage and integrate with existing UCF Center for Community Schools infrastructure, including technical assistance staff and the training academy, as part of a blended delivery model. This may include models where

external support complements internal capacity-building efforts, rather than duplicating them, with a clear pathway for knowledge transfer and sustainability over time.

While pricing should still account for the full potential scope of up to 50 sites, respondents should clearly articulate how costs scale across phases, how support intensity may shift over time, and how UCF's existing staff and training structures are incorporated to maximize efficiency, effectiveness, and long-term sustainability.

97) Supplier Question:

In-Person Convenings and Summits – Section 1.1, Page 7 and Section 2.42, Page 24

The scope references bi-annual in-person convenings and annual data-informed summits, while Section 2.42 states travel expenses may not be charged without prior written approval. Should respondents include travel costs within the fixed fee, exclude travel costs, or identify travel separately as an ancillary expense subject to prior approval?

UCF Answer:

Respondents should include travel costs within the proposed fixed fee. The preference is for all anticipated travel associated with the bi-annual in-person convenings and annual data-informed summits to be fully incorporated into the contract price to ensure budget predictability and administrative simplicity.

While Section 2.42 notes that travel expenses may not be charged without prior written approval, for the purposes of this procurement, respondents should assume that required project-related travel is part of the defined scope and should be priced accordingly within the fixed fee structure. Any assumptions related to travel (e.g., number of trips, staffing levels attending, or geographic considerations) should be clearly stated in the proposal.

98) Supplier Question:

Pricing Format – Section 3.2(D), Page 30

Section 3.2(D) requests a fixed fee, billing rates for personnel, and any ancillary expense categories. Is there a preferred pricing template or format, or may respondents provide their own pricing schedule?

UCF Answer:

Respondents may provide their own pricing schedule, provided it clearly aligns with the requirements outlined in Section 3.2(D), including a fixed fee structure, detailed billing rates for personnel, and any applicable ancillary expense categories. While there is flexibility in format, proposals should be transparent, easy to interpret, and sufficiently detailed to support evaluation and comparison across respondents.

It is also important to note that payment will be tied to agreed-upon deliverables and milestones rather than solely to time and materials. As such, respondents should structure their pricing in a way that aligns costs with key project outputs and phases, ensuring clear linkage between deliverables, timelines, and invoicing. This approach is intended to support accountability, progress tracking, and successful completion of project objectives.

99) Supplier Question:

Proposal Attachments – Section 3.2 and Appendix III, Pages 29–30 and 35

Appendix III allows multiple files. Please confirm whether respondents should submit one combined proposal file plus required appendices/forms, or whether each section may be uploaded separately.

UCF Answer:

Each section may be uploaded separately.

100) Supplier Question:

Work Product Ownership – Section 2.48, Page 25

Section 2.48 references work-for-hire ownership. For pre-existing tools, templates, dashboards, methodologies, or software components used by the respondent or subcontractor, should respondents identify those as pre-existing intellectual property in the proposal?

UCF Answer:

Yes, respondents are encouraged to clearly identify any pre-existing intellectual property, including proprietary tools, templates, dashboards, methodologies, software components, or other materials that may be utilized in the performance of the work. This will help ensure clarity regarding ownership, licensing, and usage rights for any pre-existing materials incorporated into project deliverables. Any final determinations regarding intellectual property rights and work product ownership will be addressed through UCF's contracting and procurement processes.

101) Supplier Question:

FERPA/Data Security Requirements – Sections 2.52 and 2.57, Pages 26–28

Will UCF provide specific data security requirements, system access requirements, or vendor risk management documentation prior to award, or should respondents describe their proposed approach to FERPA-compliant data handling in the proposal?

UCF Answer:

The UCF Center for Community Schools has data sharing agreements with most of the school districts and with Florida Department of Education. Learning Circle employs substantive security procedures and adheres to all FERPA requirements. No identified student data is collected or held outside of Learning Circle by the UCF Center or its contractors/vendors. Security procedures for identified student data are clearly outlined in Florida statutes. Each district has slightly different rules for how they share data.

At this stage, respondents should describe their proposed approach to FERPA-compliant data handling, data security, confidentiality, and vendor risk management within their proposal, including any relevant policies, safeguards, and experience working with sensitive educational data. Additional project-specific requirements related to system access, security protocols, or vendor risk management processes may be provided during subsequent phases of procurement, contracting, or project onboarding, as applicable.

102) Supplier Question:

Background Checks – Sections 2.55 and 2.58, Pages 27–28

Will all project personnel be required to complete background checks, including those working virtually and not physically present at UCF or CPS sites?

UCF Answer:

No

103) Supplier Question:

Evaluation of Teaming/Subcontractor Experience – Section 3.2(A) and 3.2(B), Pages 29–30

May subcontractor experience and staff qualifications be included and evaluated as part of the respondent's overall experience, qualifications, and project staff capabilities?

UCF Answer:

Yes

104) Supplier Questions:

Where can I find updates on this ITN?

UCF Answer:

Updates are posted to the UCF Procurement Services website:

<https://procurement.ucf.edu/solicitations/>

Inquiries may be directed to the Procurement and Contracts Specialist, Stefanie DelGiudice, via e-mail only. No telephone calls please. Please do not contact the department directly.

Stefanie.DelGiudice@ucf.edu