



MICHELLE BAASS
DIRECTOR

State of California—Health and Human Services Agency
Department of Health Care Services



GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

SBHIP Bi-Quarterly Report Response Guidelines

Evaluation Criteria

DHCS will use the following evaluation parameters to determine the adequacy of the respective SBHIP Bi-Quarterly Report submission responses and points awarded:

- The Bi-Quarterly Report is worth ten (10) points.
- Bi-Quarterly Report deliverables with omitted requested information will receive a score of zero (0).
- No partial credit will be given for any response.
- Individual responses within the Bi-Quarterly deliverable must include specific answers for every LEA partner identified as a recipient of the specific targeted intervention.
- The Bi-Quarterly Report must satisfy all of the evaluation factors for each selected intervention.

There are a total of 10 points available for each selected intervention within this deliverable. Bi-Quarterly Reports must receive a score of 100% to be accepted by DHCS. If the Bi-Quarterly Report deliverable receives an initial score below 100%, DHCS will contact the Medi-Cal MCP and provide an opportunity to revise and resubmit the deliverable within an appropriately established timeframe.

Bi-Quarterly Report Response Guidelines

Bi-Quarterly Report responses should be clear, detailed, and help DHCS to understand:

- Challenges encountered during the intervention process as well as successes achieved.
- Any modifications made to the original project plan submissions. Progress achieved towards the successful completion of the proposed interventions.

The Bi-Quarterly Report Evaluation Guidelines are additional guidance and examples to consider when responding to the open-ended questions in the Bi-Quarterly Report. The Bi-Quarterly Report will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria noted in the “SBHIP Overview and Requirements” document. MCPs are not required to follow the guidance to receive points on the Bi-Quarterly Report.

Bi-Quarterly Report Question or Field	Guidelines to Consider / Examples
<p>1. Describe, clearly and in detail, for each selected LEA, the progress made towards implementing the selected intervention during this bi-quarterly segment. Provide documentation evidencing the level of progress reported.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify progress made for each project task included in the Project Plan. b. Include responses for each of the partnering LEAs. c. Where possible, attach or cite documentation that provides evidence of the progress made on the intervention, such as stakeholder engagement data or survey findings.
<p>2. Identify the current status of the SBHIP targeted intervention: (On Track / Not On Track)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify the project as “On Track” or “Not on Track”.
<p>3. If the project is Not On Track, has SBHIP Technical Assistance been contacted? (Yes / No)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. For projects identified as “Not on Track”, please identify whether you contacted the SBHIP inbox (SBHIP@guidehouse.com) for Technical Assistance.
<p>4. If the SBHIP targeted intervention is not on track, explain, clearly and in detail, why and identify what actions will be taken to remedy the current course. If the project is on track, write N/A. (100 words or less per LEA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. For projects identified as “Not on Track”, identify the nature of the issue, as well as remedial actions needed to make progress on the project. b. If applicable, list actions you will take per participating LEA. c. Include an anticipated implementation timeline for any actions to remedy the current course.

Bi-Quarterly Report Question or Field	Guidelines to Consider / Examples
<p>5. Have there been any changes in SBHIP partners based on the Project Plan submission? (Yes / No)</p> <p>If changes have been made, describe clearly and in detail, why. (100 words or less per LEA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify any changes in SBHIP partners after the Project Plan submission. b. Changes may include adding or removing SBHIP partners. c. If SBHIP partners changed, include a rationale for the change and potential impacts on the project scope.
<p>6. Have there been any changes to the student population initially identified as recipients of the selected intervention? (Yes / No)</p> <p>If changes have been made, describe clearly and in detail, why. (100 words or less per LEA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify any changes to the target student population identified on the intervention's Project Plan. b. If the student population changed, include a rationale as to why the selected student population changed. c. If applicable, identify whether the change impacted the participation of Medi-Cal students in the intervention.
<p>7. Please identify, clearly and in detail, any current internal SBHIP challenges experienced in connection with this project at this point. (100 words or less per LEA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If applicable, include any internal challenges between SBHIP partners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. For example, challenges may include Targeted Intervention funding, resource or capacity issues, or collaboration issues between SBHIP partners. b. If challenges were identified, include planned actions to address the challenges.
<p>8. Please identify, clearly and in detail, any current external SBHIP challenges experienced in connection with this project at this point. (100 words or less per LEA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If applicable, include any external challenges involving non-SBHIP-partners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. For example, challenges may include limited communication/collaboration with non-MCP stakeholders or aligning / coordinating intervention activities with non-SBHIP stakeholders. b. If challenges were identified, include planned actions to address the challenges.