

# Public Health Infrastructure Grant (PHIG)

## Request for Proposals – PHIG Workforce and Indirectly Funded Sub-Evaluations

Purpose	National Network of Public Health Institutes (NNPHI), on behalf of the PHIG National Evaluation Team (NET), seeks to fund up to 2 sub-evaluations aimed at examining questions of importance and significance within the PHIG evaluation. Information generated will rapidly advance a robust knowledge base regarding promising and effective strategies to strengthen the U.S. public health infrastructure.	
Evaluation Topics	<b>Workforce Evaluation</b> - Assessing the Effectiveness of PHIG Workforce Strategies: Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention Efforts, Workforce Development Processes, and Staff Training. Funded at <i>up to</i> \$550,000 via a phased contracting approach. Anticipated to last up to 24 months.	<b>Indirectly Funded Evaluation</b> - Assessing the Impact of PHIG on Indirectly and Unfunded Health Department. Funded at <i>up to</i> \$350,000 via a phased contracting approach. Anticipated to last up to 18 months.
Eligibility	Teams with demonstrated expertise and experience conducting process, impact, and outcome program evaluations of public health initiatives that involve complex, multi-site designs, with training in both program evaluation methods and research/data analysis. Applicants are strongly encouraged to submit a Notice of Intent that will enable management of perceived conflicts of interest. Please note that receiving existing PHIG-related funding is <u>not</u> a disqualifying factor for this RFP.	
Notice of intent deadline	Tuesday, October 8th, 2024 at 10 pm ET <a href="https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/b7799c909be048708ef7ecaa0c4bced8">https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/b7799c909be048708ef7ecaa0c4bced8</a>	
Proposal application deadline	Wednesday, October 30th, 2024 at 10pm ET <a href="https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/9510d19fef5d4a42a2cf1495dde5cd80">https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/9510d19fef5d4a42a2cf1495dde5cd80</a>	

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	2
Who is Eligible to Apply? .....	3
Background .....	4
National Network of Public Health Institutes (NNPHI): .....	4
Overview of the Public Health Infrastructure Grant (PHIG): .....	4
Introduction to the National Evaluation Team (NET): .....	4
PHIG Sub-Evaluations .....	5
Sub-evaluation Topics .....	5
Table 1: PHIG Sub-evaluation Topics .....	5
Collaboration with the NET .....	5
Collaboration with the Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG) .....	6
Project Management and Reporting Expectations .....	7
Meetings and Project Management .....	7
Documentation and Reporting .....	8
Table 2: Documentation and Reporting .....	8
Funding Availability and Budgetary Requirements .....	9
Table 3: Funding Amounts for Sub-Evaluation Topics .....	9
Notice of Intent .....	10
Proposal Requirements .....	10
Table 4: Proposal Requirements .....	12
RFP and Project Timeline .....	15
Table 5: Anticipated Project Timeline (subject to change): .....	17
Proposal Scoring and Selection Criteria .....	18
Notice to Applicants .....	19
Disclosure .....	19

## Who is Eligible to Apply?

Organizations applying for this funding must meet the following criteria:

- Demonstrated expertise and experience conducting process, impact, and outcome program evaluations of public health initiatives that involve complex, multi-site designs, with training in both program evaluation methods, evaluation reporting, and research/data analysis.
- Experience evaluating public health programs implemented at the federal, state, county, city, territories and freely associated states (TFAS) government level, including health departments at the policy and/or programmatic levels as well as tribal jurisdictions.
- Experience using the CDC Framework for Evaluation, with a preference for experience with Utilization-Focused Evaluation and/or Participatory Evaluation.
- Demonstrated subject-matter expertise in the topic of focus for the selected sub-evaluation preferred.
- Capacity to effectively design and implement the evaluation project, including managing data collection and analysis, evaluation, and financial reporting.
- Demonstrated ability to use culturally and linguistically appropriate methods that are tailored to the needs of the individuals, organizations, and/or communities of focus.
- Demonstrated track record of contributing to peer-reviewed literature and/or translating and disseminating evaluation findings to a practice-based audience.

Organizations may choose to partner and apply together. However, one organization must be identified as the primary entity responsible for managing funds and deliverables.

Organizations may apply for multiple sub-evaluation topics. Separate proposal submissions are required for each topic.

Organizations currently receiving PHIG-related funding are eligible to apply. They must disclose any potential perceived conflicts of interest and, if applicable, describe measures to maintain separation between existing PHIG work and proposed sub-evaluation activities. Prospective candidates are strongly encouraged to complete the Notice of Intent process for screening potential perceived conflicts of interest before submitting full proposals.

*NNPHI believes that a diverse applicant pool will support the achievement of the project outcomes and welcomes proposals from a diverse range of organizations and teams. While the term “organizations” is used throughout this RFP, any team of individuals who meets the eligibility criteria may apply, including nonprofits, businesses, universities, LLCs, etc. If a team is unsure about eligibility requirements, please reach out to [PHIGE2A@nnphi.org](mailto:PHIGE2A@nnphi.org) or attend our office hours for additional information or support.*

## Background

*National Network of Public Health Institutes (NNPHI):* Mobilizing 50-member public health institutes with over \$2.2 billion in annual funding as well as 10 university-based regional training centers and 40 affiliates, [NNPHI](#) connects more than 12,000 subject-matter experts with organizational partners across the nation. With an expansive organizational presence and activities across all 50 states, the national network is a go-to resource for analysis and best practices. NNPHI also provides important network connections for communities, government agencies, foundations, the health care delivery system, media, and academia.

*Overview of the Public Health Infrastructure Grant (PHIG):* The Center for Disease Control's (CDC) [Public Health Infrastructure Grant \(PHIG\)](#) is a groundbreaking investment supporting critical public health infrastructure. Funding from this grant is designed to ensure that health departments have the people, resources, and systems they need to assess, promote, and protect health in the communities they serve. Funding was awarded to 107 state, local, and territorial health departments ("recipients") and three national public health partners ("National Partners"); it will be distributed over a five-year period (12/1/2022 - 11/30/2027). CDC provided guidance to recipients that "no less than 40% of the funding provided to state health department recipients for Strategy A1 Workforce should be distributed among the local health departments that have not received direct funding from this grant." Local jurisdictions that were not direct recipients are known as "indirectly funded health departments." The CDC PHIG website [provides maps to visualize the funded jurisdictions](#).

The purpose of PHIG is to implement activities that strengthen public health outcomes, utilizing a funding model that gives health departments the flexibility to direct funds towards specific organizational and community needs. The PHIG National Partners, consisting of the [Association of State and Territorial Health Officials \(ASTHO\)](#), National Network of Public Health Institutes (NNPHI), and [Public Health Accreditation Board \(PHAB\)](#), support the work of the funded health departments by providing training and technical assistance, evaluating the overall grant, and facilitating coordination and communication across recipients and CDC.

*Introduction to the National Evaluation Team (NET):* Alongside PHAB, NNPHI collaboratively leads the NET as it plans and implements a user-engaged national evaluation of PHIG. PHIG National Partners are committed to minimizing recipient burden, and the national evaluation is coordinated across partners, prioritizing the utilization of existing data sources and mitigating duplicative and unnecessary data collection. Throughout 2023 and 2024, the NET has actively engaged with grant recipients, national partners, CDC staff, evaluation subject matter experts, and other organizations to develop a user-engaged evaluation plan, which includes a robust set of evaluation questions as well as [PHIG logic models](#), and formed an Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG). The evaluation plan is guided by the [CDC Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health](#).

For additional background on the PHIG evaluation, please see the [Public Health Infrastructure Grant National Grant Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Executive Summary](#) and attend [the PHIG Sub-Evaluation RFP Informational Webinar](#) on October 7th.

## PHIG Sub-Evaluations

*Sub-evaluation Topics:* On behalf of the PHIG NET, NNPHI is seeking to fund up to 2 sub-evaluations aimed at examining questions of importance and significance that users of the information have generated for the PHIG evaluation. Descriptions of each can be accessed via the hyperlinks provided in Table 1. Applicants may compete for multiple sub-evaluation topics. Separate proposal submissions are required for each topic.

Information generated through the sub-evaluations is intended to rapidly advance a robust knowledge base regarding promising and effective strategies to strengthen the U.S. public health infrastructure including increasing the capacity and competency of the public health workforce, strengthening the foundational capabilities, addressing health equity, demonstrating effectiveness, and improving health outcomes. This information is intended to inform local and national programmatic and policymaking decisions. Future sub-evaluation topics will be released for RFP as additional areas of interest are identified.

*Table 1: PHIG Sub-evaluation Topics*

---

[Assessing the Effectiveness of PHIG Workforce Strategies: Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention Efforts, Workforce Development Processes, and Staff Training \(“Workforce”\)](#)

---

[Assessing the Impact of PHIG on Indirectly and Unfunded Health Departments \(“Indirectly Funded”\)](#)

---

## Collaboration with the NET

Principal Investigators (PIs) selected to lead an evaluation team for the PHIG sub-evaluations will engage regularly with NNPHI’s management team and the NET to monitor and guide the evaluation design and implementation process. In alignment with the NET’s commitment to reducing recipient burden, PIs’ proposed qualitative and quantitative data collection approaches must be reviewed and approved by the NET to ensure:

- Data cannot be obtained through existing data sources;
- Data is not already being obtained through other primary data sources across PHIG or other partners;
- Participants, especially recipients, are not already engaged by another primary data collection efforts across PHIG.

To reduce recipient burden, the NET plans to administer a recurring recipient survey throughout the grant so that questions asked of recipients quantitatively are streamlined into one data collection mechanism. Quantitative data collection proposed by sub-evaluation PIs will be considered for inclusion in the survey.

## **Collaboration with the Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG)**

The PHIG EAG is composed of individuals and organizations that will actively use the evaluation findings and have actively contributed to the development of evaluation questions that informed the sub-evaluation topics. This group plays a pivotal role in ensuring that the evaluation process is both relevant and practical. The EAG provides a structured mechanism for participants to have input into how the evaluation is designed and implemented, ensuring their perspectives and needs are considered at every stage.

PI engagements with the EAG will facilitate open dialogue and collaborative decision-making to ensure that the evaluation remains aligned with the stakeholders' goals and contexts. The EAG's responsibilities include reviewing evaluation plans, providing feedback on methodologies, suggesting data sources, and assisting in the interpretation and dissemination of findings. This collaborative approach ensures that the evaluation is grounded in practical reality and addresses the needs of those it aims to serve.

PIs and EAG members will work in collaboration with the NET to ensure that plans, deliverables, and decision points are aligned with the broader national evaluation plan, and NNPHI will work closely with PIs on the sub-evaluations to ensure smooth communication and finalize decision making. Under the guidance of NNPHI and the NET, PIs will present their evaluation strategies and proposed activities to the EAG, seeking their input and guidance. This process involves:

1. **Defining and Describing Strategies:** PIs will work with the EAG to comprehensively define and describe the strategies and activities to be evaluated, ensuring they are relevant, actionable, and equitable.
2. **Assessing Evaluability:** Together with the EAG, PIs will assess the evaluability of the strategies and activities proposed, determining whether they can be effectively evaluated given the available resources and context.
3. **Developing Evaluation Design:** PIs will collaborate with the EAG to develop a robust evaluation design, incorporating methodologies that are both rigorous and aligned with stakeholders' needs.
4. **Gathering Credible Information:** The EAG will coordinate with PIs to identify key data sources and provide guidance on the data collection process, ensuring it is thorough and credible, while minimizing response burden.

5. **Interpreting Results:** The EAG will play a crucial role in interpreting evaluation results, providing contextual knowledge and stakeholder perspectives that are essential for drawing meaningful conclusions.
6. **Communicating Findings:** PIs will work with the EAG to develop communication strategies tailored to various audiences, ensuring that findings are accessible and actionable. These are anticipated to include conference presentations with NNPHI and NET partners and a robust final report, at minimum. Reporting will be fully integrated into the NET's dissemination strategy, led by NNPHI and PHAB. Individual products for dissemination (e.g. toolkits, webinars, contributions to peer-reviewed publications) will be negotiated during the contracting phase, specific to each sub-evaluation.

By actively engaging the EAG throughout the evaluation lifecycle, the sub-evaluations will adhere to the CDC's Framework for Evaluation and the principles of utilization-focused evaluation. This collaborative approach ensures that the evaluations conducted are not merely exercises in data collection and analysis but are practical tools that will drive real-world improvements in public health initiatives and infrastructure. The active partnerships between PIs, the EAG, and NET will result in evaluation findings that are not only informative but also lead to actionable insights and improvements, ultimately enhancing public health outcomes.

## **Project Management and Reporting Expectations**

*[For the purposes of this RFP, the terms contract, award, funding, and sub-awardee are used interchangeably, and are not intended to imply a required distinction between subawards and contracts in this document, as this distinction may differ across vendors and sub-evaluations.]*

*Meetings and Project Management:* Subcontractors will become part of a collaborative team that includes members of the NNPHI management team as well as other NET partners and the EAG. Working collaboratively with these teams will be crucial to subcontractors' success at reaching their identified goals. In addition to deep expertise in complex, multi-site evaluations, the collaborative nature of the work requires strong project management and communication skills on the part of the subcontractor. PIs should account for the following minimum expectations around project management and communications when planning their proposal and budget:

- Virtual pre-contract meeting with NNPHI to ensure capacity, readiness, and facilitate planning
- Attendance at virtual kick-off and orientation meeting, facilitated by NNPHI
- Bi-weekly virtual meetings with NNPHI management team
- Up to monthly virtual meetings with the EAG
- Quarterly virtual meetings with the NET

- Quarterly virtual technical assistance calls with NNPHI evaluation and management teams as well as other subcontractors (opportunity to coordinate data management, share challenges, peer learning, etc.)
- Email and video call communications as needed to support project deliverables

*Documentation and Reporting:* PIs will be expected to document their work and submit it for collaborative review and feedback by the NNPHI management team as well as the NET and the EAG. Documents pertaining to the design and implementation of the sub-evaluation (leading to final reporting in Phase 1 and implementation strategies in Phase 2) may go through multiple rounds of review by NNPHI, the NET, CDC, and the EAG. Minimum expectations around documentation and reporting are described in Table 2.

*Table 2: Documentation and Reporting*

Type of Report/Documentation	Frequency	Audience	Purpose
Invoices and progress reports submitted to NNPHI management team	Monthly	NNPHI management team	Contract monitoring
Evidence of contract(s) executed with any subcontracted vendors or partners	As necessary	NNPHI management team	Contract monitoring
Progress reports submitted to the NET, including preliminary findings	Bi-monthly	NET	Progress monitoring
Key documents relating to the design and planned implementation of the sub-evaluation including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluation plan including evaluation questions, logic model, data collection and methods/analysis plan (Phase 1 deliverable report) *</li> <li>- Final evaluation report(s) by phase (Phase 1 &amp; 2 deliverable) *</li> <li>- Slide deck of evaluation findings (Phase 2 deliverable) *</li> <li>- Other dissemination products to be developed in collaboration with the EAG and the NET *</li> </ul>	Anticipated timeline described in Table 5 (subject to change)	NNPHI management team, NET, CDC, EAG	Feedback on strategy and design  Alignment with needs and strategies

\*Publication, presentation, or data sharing of any kind will be in coordination with NNPHI and the NET. Publication, presentation, or data sharing (including contributions) without approval in any format will not be allowed and appropriate authorship must be discussed.



## Funding Availability and Budgetary Requirements

Successful applicants will be awarded the funding amounts detailed in Table 3 through a phased funding structure. NNPHI intends to select one subcontractor for each of the project domains identified. **This will be a modular award with two clear phases.**

*Table 3: Funding Amounts for Sub-Evaluation Topics*

Topic	<a href="#">PHIG Workforce Evaluation</a>	<a href="#">Indirectly Funded Evaluation</a>
<b>Phase 1</b>	Up to \$150,000 to be awarded via contract	Up to \$100,000 to be awarded via contract
<b>Phase 2</b>	Up to \$400,000 to be awarded via contract amendment upon successful completion of Phase 1 workplan and deliverables	Up to \$250,000 to be awarded via contract amendment upon successful completion of Phase 1 workplan and deliverables
<b>Total</b>	Up to \$550,000 via phased contracting approach	Up to \$350,000 via phased contracting approach

**Phase 1** will focus on working collaboratively with the EAG and project partners to confirm the area of interest, the evaluability of the topic (i.e., can it be done and through what approach), and designing an evaluation plan, logic model, and variable matrix that identifies appropriate data sources.

**Phase 2** will involve operationalizing and implementing the evaluation plan and continuing the collaborative approach with the EAG and project partners. This phase will culminate in a final report and final presentation to NNPHI, the NET and the EAG, as well as an anticipated conference presentation with NNPHI and/or NET partners. It will also include the development of dissemination products designed in collaboration with the EAG and the NET.

**Proposals submitted to this RFP will be awarded Phase 1 funding only if selected.** Contracting for Phase 2 funds is contingent upon successful completion of phase 1 workplan tasks and deliverables, and successful demonstration of collaborative engagement with project partners.

Subcontractors who complete Phase 1 deliverable submission will receive preference for Phase 2 funding, but NNPHI reserves the right to re-compete funding for Phase 2 awards, or to revise contracts to avoid conflicts of interest.

## Notice of Intent

Prospective candidates are strongly encouraged to submit a notice of intent so that NNPHI can ensure that applying PIs do not have actual or perceived conflicts of interest related to the larger grant. Organization name, contact information, disclosure of PHIG-related funding, and selected sub-evaluation topic for which applicants will submit a proposal are to be submitted [via Smartsheet](#) by Tuesday, October 8<sup>th</sup> at 10pm ET. Notice of intent is non-binding and will not be scored as part of the proposal review process. Full proposals will be due by Wednesday, October 30<sup>th</sup>.

Prospective candidates who submit a notice of intent will be screened on a rolling basis and eligibility will be confirmed by NNPHI no later than Friday, October 11<sup>th</sup>. If the notice of intent is not received by the deadline, candidates' eligibility will be screened at the time of application.

## Proposal Requirements

Proposal requirements are detailed in Table 4 and summarized below. **Submissions missing any of the required components will not be considered.** Proposals must be formatted for letter-sized pages (8.5" x 11") with 1" margins, using Calibri font, and a minimum font size of 11-point. All documents must be submitted by attaching to the submission form in .pdf format and according to the file naming convention described in Table 4. Applicants may compete for multiple sub-evaluation topics. Separate submissions are required for each topic. All required information regarding the substance of the project should be included in the project proposal. Appendices should not be used to circumvent page limits.

1. Project Abstract: Provide a self-contained summary (maximum of 500 words) of how your organization might approach the evaluation (both Phase 1 & Phase 2). This summary must not include any proprietary or confidential information.
2. Organizational Capacity and Resources: Provide a description of your organization's capacity to manage federal funds and track expenditures on federal awards, produce required reporting, and provide anticipated support for the proposed work. Identify whether your organization has received federal funding previously. Provide existing knowledge of ethical and IRB standards. Clearly identify ability and staff capacity to incorporate best practices in developing equitable evaluation methods. Specify any prior experience utilizing culturally and linguistically appropriate services with focused reduction on participant burden.
3. Funding disclosure from PHIG and role description in the project: If your organization is receiving funding for PHIG-related work, please disclose the funding award details and provide information regarding your role on the project. If applicable, please describe measures that will be taken to maintain separation between existing PHIG work and proposed sub-evaluation activities. Applicant organizations currently not receiving

funding for PHIG-related work are required to submit a statement acknowledging this component.

4. Project Narrative: Phase 1 & Phase 2: Identify the sub-evaluation topic and associated national evaluation questions. Provide a summary of how your organization has done this work in the past including describing approaches/strategies used, engaging stakeholders, developing the design for both process and impact/outcome evaluations, collecting credible evidence, data analysis, and reporting. Propose a plan for carrying out Phase 1 and Phase 2 work, consistent with the requirements in this RFP. Include proposed evaluation questions (selected, modified, or developed from sub-evaluation abstract themes A-D), proposed indicators, proposed methodology, as well as data sources and a potential analysis plan. Applicants are not expected to propose data collection across all 107 recipients and should suggest sampling approaches that reflect the proposed strategies and approaches. Include a timeline for the work.
5. Scope of Work (SOW) and Budget: Phase 1 & Phase 2: Propose a budget to complete an evaluation plan outlining specific costs (hourly rates, personnel, supplies, etc.) up to funds available for Phases 1 and 2. Budgets for Phase 1 and Phase 2 activities should be distinct.

Table 4: Proposal Requirements

Application Headings	Requirements
<p><b>1. Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Brief description of the organization’s mission and reach</li> <li>b. Summary of how the organization meets the selection criteria</li> <li>c. Brief description of the organization’s intended activities for both Phases 1 and 2</li> </ul>	<p>500 word maximum.</p> <p>File naming convention: ApplicantName_PHIGRFP_abstract</p>
<p><b>2. Organizational Capacity and Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Organizational capacity to design and implement the evaluation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Organization name and SAM registration</li> <li>ii. Documentation of federally negotiated indirect rate</li> <li>iii. Description of team members* including:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PI</li> <li>2. Fiscal/contractual lead</li> <li>3. Team member names and qualifications</li> <li>4. Subject-matter expertise</li> <li>5. Evaluation experience and expertise</li> </ul> </li> <li>iv. Experience using:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CDC Framework for Evaluation</li> <li>2. Utilization-Focused Evaluation (UFE)</li> <li>3. Participatory evaluation strategies</li> <li>4. Equitable evaluation approaches</li> <li>5. Impact Evaluation</li> <li>6. Mixed methods data collection and integration approaches</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Experience evaluating public health initiatives at the federal, state, county, city, territories and/or freely associated state government level, including with health departments and tribal jurisdictions</li> <li>c. Project management approaches and standards</li> </ul> <p><i>*All team members included in this proposal must be named. Proposals listing “TBD” team members may be excluded. Note: Brief 1-page biosketches of PI and principal staff may be uploaded as a supplement to the application and will not be counted as a part of this page limit.</i></p>	<p>5 pages maximum</p> <p>File naming convention: ApplicantName_PHIGRFP_capacityresources</p> <p>File naming convention for biosketches: ApplicantName_PHIGRFP_biosketchLastName</p>
<p><b>3. Funding disclosure from PHIG and role description in the project</b></p>	<p>1 page</p>

<p>Applicants currently receiving funding for PHIG-related work must disclose the funding award details and provide information regarding the organization’s role on the project. Any team members included in this application with current roles on PHIG-related work should be described. PHIG-related work through a subaward is not necessarily an exclusionary item but will be used to manage potential conflicts of interest. Applicants not currently receiving funding for PHIG-related work are required to submit a statement acknowledging this component.</p> <p>Applicants who complete the Notice of Intent by Tuesday, October 8th will be screened prior to proposal submission and eligibility will be confirmed. If a notice of eligibility was received, please submit the notice letter for this component.</p>	<p>File naming convention: ApplicantName_PHIGRFP_disclosure</p>
<p><b>4. Project Narrative: Phase 1 &amp; Phase 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Selected sub-evaluation topic</li> <li>b. Summary of proposed approach for both Phase 1 (develop the evaluation plan) and Phase 2 (implement the evaluation) in collaboration with the NET &amp; EAG. Applicants must incorporate the CDC Framework for Evaluation and utilization-focused evaluation principles and are encouraged to propose equitable evaluation approaches. Applicants must select, modify, and/or develop evaluation questions (should include themes from categories A-D in the sub-evaluation abstract) and include potential evaluation approaches for each question.</li> <li>c. Proposed evaluation plan summary matrix (see example and <a href="#">template</a>) that includes a summary of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Proposed evaluation questions</li> <li>ii. Potential evaluation approaches</li> <li>iii. Potential methods and data sources</li> </ol> </li> <li>d. Proposed Timeline (include both Phase 1 &amp; Phase 2)</li> </ol>	<p>10 pages maximum</p> <p>File naming convention: ApplicantName_PHIGRFP_narrative</p> <p>See template for requirements: <a href="#">Evaluation Plan Summary Matrix</a></p>
<p><b>5. Scope of Work (SOW) and Budget: Phase 1 &amp; Phase 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Phase 1 SOW, line-item budget, and budget narrative</li> <li>b. Phase 2 SOW, line-item budget, and budget narrative</li> </ol> <p>Note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Applicants are required to submit their SOW and budget via either the FTE or Hourly budget template as NNPHI utilizes a cost-incurred reimbursement model.</li> <li>b. While applicants will submit proposals and budgets for both Phase 1 and Phase 2, this round of funding is for Phase 1 funding only. Approval and funding of Phase 2 scopes of work and budgets are contingent upon successful completion of Phase 1 activities and deliverables.</li> </ol>	<p>See templates for requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Budget template for hourly rates</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Budget template for FTE</a></li> </ul> <p>File naming convention: ApplicantName_PHIGRFP_budget</p>

- 
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>c. Awards made in response to this solicitation will be considered either federal sub-awards or contracts and require monthly invoicing.</li><li>d. Applicants should budget for travel to one in-person meeting to take place Spring 2025.</li><li>e. Funding under this mechanism may NOT include the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Food or catering services</li><li>- Capital expenses over \$5,000</li><li>- Equipment purchases</li><li>- Per HHS requirements, funds awarded under this RFP are subject to the individual salary cap listed in the federal Executive Schedule Level II (currently \$221,900).</li></ul></li></ul> |  |
|--|--|
-

## RFP and Project Timeline

Awards will be made by November 2024. Program orientation and kick-off will be scheduled in December 2024. Selected subcontractors will be expected to implement their proposal beginning in December 2024.

Request for proposals issued	<p>Friday, September 27th</p> <p>Please submit applications at  <a href="https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/9510d19fef5d4a42a2cf1495dde5cd80">https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/9510d19fef5d4a42a2cf1495dde5cd80</a></p>
<p>Office hours for questions, support, or technical assistance.</p> <p><i>The informational webinar will be a presentation introduction to PHIG. That session will be recorded for viewing afterward.</i></p> <p>For questions or assistance, please contact PHIGE2A@nnphi.org</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>PHIG Sub-Evaluation RFP Informational Webinar:</i>  Monday, October 7<sup>th</sup>, 12-1pm ET:  Register here:  <a href="https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_FOsnMerTK2Oh4Zxyjwolw">https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_FOsnMerTK2Oh4Zxyjwolw</a></li> <li>2. <i>Office hours:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thursday, October 17th, 3-4pm ET:  Register here:  <a href="https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJwkcuuqqzsqEtTWtYx-IXL4aT6wBpeQvpS6">https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJwkcuuqqzsqEtTWtYx-IXL4aT6wBpeQvpS6</a></li> <li>• Wednesday, October 23rd, 4-5pm ET:  Register here:  <a href="https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJwudeCgqj8qGdQ0IW7k7F8K6OHHdDU8fged">https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJwudeCgqj8qGdQ0IW7k7F8K6OHHdDU8fged</a></li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Notice of Intent	<p>Due no later than 5 pm Hawai'i time/7pm PT/10pm ET  Tuesday, October 8th</p> <p>Submit here:  <a href="https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/b7799c909be048708ef7ecaa0c4bcd8">https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/b7799c909be048708ef7ecaa0c4bcd8</a></p>
Confirmation of eligibility	<p>Proposed applicants who complete the Notice of Intent will be notified of their eligibility to no later than Friday, October 11th.</p>
Proposal submission deadline	<p>5pm Hawai'i time/7pm PT/10pm ET  Wednesday, October 30th, 2024*</p> <p>*No late submissions will be accepted.</p>

Invites sent for pre-contract meetings for verifications of capacity and scope	November 11-15
Pre-contract meetings	November 18 - 22
Notices of award	December 2-13, 2024
Earliest start date for implementation	December 2-13, 2024 (kickoff meeting to be held virtually with NNPHI and NET partners)



Table 5: Anticipated Project Timeline (subject to change):

Phase	Timeline	Nov '24	Dec '24	Jan '25	Feb '25	Mar '25	Apr '25	May '25	June '25	July '25	Aug '25	Sept '25	Oct '25	Nov '25	Dec '25	Jan '26	Feb '26	Mar '26	Apr '26	May '26
<b>Pre-award</b>	Pre-award meeting																			
	Contracting																			
<b>Phase 1</b>	Kick-off meeting																			
	Evaluation plan draft																			
	Submit draft evaluation plan for feedback from NET + EAG																			
	Finalize evaluation plan																			
<b>Phase 2*</b> [if selected]	Process amendment to Phase 1 subcontract to include Phase 2																			
	Data collection (where applicable) and cleaning																			
	Data analysis, sharing, and co-interpretation with NET & EAG																			
	Develop draft evaluation report																			
	Submit draft evaluation report for feedback from NET + EAG																			
	Submit final evaluation report and slide deck																			
	Dissemination of findings, project wrap up																			

\* Note that for the Workforce Evaluation, Phase 2 funding period may last up to 18 months. The above timeline may be extended according to applicant's anticipated needs.

## Proposal Scoring and Selection Criteria

Notice of Intent will be screened by NNPHI and the NET to confirm eligibility.

Full proposals will be scored by a team of reviewers from NNPHI, PHAB, and ASTHO. Proposals will first be screened for completion, and then scored using the following criteria:

*Screening Criteria:* Proposals must meet the following screening requirements or will be disqualified:

1. Is the submission complete (i.e., include all requirement elements)?
2. Does the applicant have the required documents attached?
3. Is the applicant eligible based on disclosure of existing PHIG-related funding, perceived conflicts of interest, and/or demonstration of firewall between existing PHIG-related work and work outlined in proposal?

*Review Criteria:* Proposals that advance beyond the screening stage will be scored on a scale of 1 (low) to 9 (high), and a mean score for all items will be calculated:

1. Is justification for the scope and focus clearly provided, with appropriate valid evidence and appropriate parameters?
2. Does the plan consider collaborative workplans with the EAG and NET?
3. Is the plan being proposed feasible given available resources and the proposed design?
4. Does the team possess sufficient expertise and experience for this work in terms of *skills in evaluation*?
  - Is there discussion of prior experiences that demonstrate evaluation capacity?
  - Are appropriate evaluation questions, evaluation designs, and potential data collection and analysis approaches identified?
  - Is there discussion of how credible evidence and data will be synthesized and/or triangulated to inform findings?
  - Is there discussion of theoretical framework, utilization focused evaluation, the CDC framework for evaluation, and experience in collaborative approaches?
  - Is there inclusion of equitable evaluation approaches that respond to the needs of diverse communities?
5. Does the team demonstrate sufficient expertise and experience for this work in terms of *subject matter expertise* for the sub-evaluation topic applied to?
6. Does the methodological approach demonstrate *innovation, creativity*, and include approaches that will yield *meaningful insights* using various sources of data?
  - How strong is the evidence provided for the choice of strategy?
  - Is the approach sufficiently justified?
7. Is the budget proposal appropriate and does it include all required elements?

## **Notice to Applicants**

This RFP is not binding on NNPHI or the NET, nor does it constitute a contractual offer. Without limiting the foregoing, NNPHI and the NET reserve the right, in its sole discretion, to reject any or all proposals; to modify, supplement, or cancel the RFP; to waive any deviation from the RFP; to negotiate regarding any proposal; and to negotiate final terms and conditions that may differ from those stated in the RFP. Under no circumstances shall ASTHO/NNPHI/PHAB be liable for any costs incurred by any person in connection with the preparation and submission of a response to this RFP.

## **Disclosure**

This work is supported by funds made available from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), National Center for STLT Public Health Infrastructure and Workforce, through OE22-2203: Strengthening U.S. Public Health Infrastructure, Workforce, and Data Systems grant. The contents are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official views of, nor an endorsement, by CDC/HHS, or the U.S. Government.