

February 15, 2010

Responses to Questions Received Regarding 2010 Arizona Health Survey RFP

1. Assessment of the 2008 Survey: What aspects of the survey work performed in 2008 was SLHI dissatisfied with? Other than a greater emphasis on families with young children, are there any aspects of the 2008 survey that SLHI would want done differently in 2010?

We have revised many of the survey questions used in 2008 to capture information that is of most interest to SLHI and its community partners. For example, more information will be captured on access to care and behavioral health. We have also streamlined questions related to health coverage, and eliminated many questions that were deemed to be less pertinent to SLHI's work.

Our most serious concern with the 2008 survey was the limited sample size, particularly for children. We are addressing this issue in 2010 by expanding our sample size for adults and children. We are no longer performing a survey of adolescents, instead focusing on a greater sample size for young children.

We were also concerned about underrepresentation among Hispanics. We have requested that potential vendors address this concern in their proposals.

2. Budget: On Page 5 the RFP lists its Criteria for Selection. This list does not allocate any points to price. Usually when price is not a selection criteria this is because there is a fixed price budget threshold that has been assigned to the project. Yet we could find no reference to such a budget amount in the RFP. Can you provide bidders any further information about the upper limit budget available for the completion of the 2010 survey?

We are most interested in the quality of the methodological approach. The criteria selected mirrors this interest. If more than one vendor describes a sound methodological approach, cost will be used to compare vendors. However, SLHI may also choose to tailor specifications in order to manage costs.

3. Timing: The cover sheet of the RFP states that notification of the award of the contract to the successful bidder will be given on March 1, 2010. Page 24 (H) states that clean and weighted data files for both the adult survey and child survey must be delivered by June 30, 2010. Thus, the RFP assigns a total of four months from the day of notification of the winning bidder to delivery of the final data files. Page 17 (5.1) also states that it is expected that data collection would be completed over a twelve-week (3 month) period. This leaves only one month for the completion of all pre-data collection and post-data collection work tasks. The pre-data collection work tasks include (a) finalization of a contract agreement between SLHI and the winning bidder, which must be concluded before any work can begin, (b) review and comment of the draft instruments for both the adult and child surveys, (c) translation into Spanish of any questions modified during this review, (d) programming of the final English and Spanish instruments onto CATI, (e) completion of CATI pilot testing of the instruments and (f) development and purchase of both RDD samples for the adult and child-with companion-adult surveys and commercial lists for the child-only oversamples. The post-data collection work tasks include (a) data processing of both the adult and child data files, including the creation and coding of

open-ended questions, referenced on Page 18 (6.1) and the possible upcoding of “other specify” comments to other survey questions, (b) all data checking and cleaning of the files, (c) the creation and application of statistical weights to each file, and (d) the delivery of the final clean and weighted data files with documentation to SLHI. A one-month timeframe for the completion of all of these tasks seems unrealistic, especially for non-incumbent bidders. Given that the incumbent has a head start in completing many of these tasks, would SLHI be willing to relax this timeline if a firm other than the incumbent were selected? If so, by how much?

We are willing to entertain other timeframes proposed by a bidder. However, SLHI has made commitments to its community partners to provide data from the survey by mid to late summer 2010. We must honor those commitments.

4. Delivery of initial codebook and data file: Page 18 (5.4) states that “after one week of data collection or after 200 interviews have been completed (whichever is first), contractor will provide to SLHI both raw and weighted SPSS data files and frequency distributions of all questions asked in both the adult and child samples. An initial code book also will be provided.” How can statistical weights be constructed for data files that contain at most 200 cases? In addition, since there will be huge amounts of data to report, preparing an initial code book from scratch and delivering it after just one week seems difficult. Given that the incumbent could carry forward most of their 2008 codebooks, would SLHI allow additional time for non-incumbents to prepare these codebooks?

The RFP should have read that the selected vendor will be responsible for providing raw data - not weighted data- after one week of data collection or 200 interviews.

It would be difficult (and costly) to construct weights for initial data. For the initial data runs, the selected vendor simply will need to identify the variables for the code book. A comprehensive code book only will be necessary at the conclusion of data collection.