

AIA RFP - Q&A Batch 1

Answered and posted July 8, 2026

Q1. Does MHR SB have any existing data visualization or reporting tools (such as Tableau, Power BI, or similar) that the consultant team can access, or should the team plan to provide those independently?

A1. The selected consultant should have the tools, resources, and technical capacity necessary to develop appropriate data visualization, reporting, and presentation materials as part of the engagement. Proposers should include any anticipated data visualization platforms, reporting tools, dashboard development needs, or related technology costs within their proposed approach and pricing.

MHR SB is not requiring the use of a specific data visualization or reporting platform for this project. Proposed tools and reporting formats should support clear communication of findings, practical use by MHR SB leadership and Trustees, data integrity, and the successful completion of the stated deliverables.

Q2. Are there any existing licenses or software subscriptions the consultant team would have access to as part of the contract?

A2. Proposers should not assume access to existing MHR SB software licenses or subscriptions as part of the contract. The selected consultant should have the tools, resources, software, and technical capacity necessary to complete the work described in the RFP.

Any anticipated software, platform, licensing, subscription, data collection, reporting, or related technology costs should be identified and included within the proposer's approach and pricing. MHR SB may provide relevant information, context, and available materials to support the engagement as appropriate, but the consultant is expected to independently provide the tools needed to successfully complete the stated deliverables.

Q3. Does MHR SB have an existing survey platform (such as Qualtrics, SurveyMonkey, or similar) available for the consultant team to use, or will the team need to procure one independently?

A3. The selected consultant should have the tools, resources, and technical capacity necessary to collect, manage, and analyze data as part of the engagement. Proposers should include any anticipated survey platforms, data collection tools, or related technology needs within their proposed approach and pricing.

MHR SB is not requiring use of a specific survey platform for this project. Any proposed tools should support effective data collection, accessibility for participants, data integrity, confidentiality, and the successful completion of the stated deliverables.

Q4. Was the Virtual Bidders Conference on Friday recorded?

A4. Yes the answers is available as well as the slides online here.

Q5. Of the five listed deliverables, which are the highest priority for MHR SB to preserve in full if scope or budget tradeoffs are needed?

A5. All of the deliverables are equal in scope and priority, it is the bidder's responsibility to determine their cost for services provided.

Q6. Is MHR SB seeking one consultant to deliver the full cross-organizational plan, or is the Board equally open to awarding selected deliverables separately if that would produce stronger results?

A6. MHR SB is seeking the strongest overall proposal that demonstrates the capacity to meet the stated deliverables with quality, efficiency, and cost effectiveness. Respondents may propose an approach that addresses the full cross-organizational plan, and MHR SB will evaluate proposals based on the ability to successfully fulfill the scope of work, the strength of the proposed methodology, organizational qualifications, and the overall value to the Board.

At this time, MHR SB's priority is to select the proposal that best meets the deliverables at an effective cost. The Board reserves the right to consider the structure of proposed services in alignment with the needs of the project and the best interests of MHR SB.

Q7. Beyond producing the written Access in Action Plan, what would success look like for MHR SB at the end of this engagement in terms of organizational alignment, community trust, or system change?

A7. Success for MHR SB would be reflected in a strong, actionable Access in Action Plan that fully captures the five stated deliverables and provides a clear pathway for the organization to move from planning to implementation. The final product should not only document recommendations, but also help MHR SB actualize a sustainable process that supports long-term organizational alignment, measurable progress, and meaningful system improvement.

At the end of the engagement, MHR SB would expect to have clearly defined outcomes, practical implementation steps, and measurement tools that allow the Board to assess progress over time. Success would also include a stronger ability to reach the community, reduce barriers to access, and ensure that individuals and families who need behavioral health services the most are better connected to available care and supports.

Q8. What existing data, survey findings, or strategic plan insights does MHR SB most want the selected consultant to build from when assessing the six access barrier domains?

A8. MHR SB expects the selected consultant to build from available and relevant information that helps inform the assessment of the six access barrier domains. This may include publicly available behavioral health data, community-level indicators, prior survey findings or engagement results where applicable, and existing MHR SB planning documents. MHR SB's current strategic plan is publicly available on the Board's website and should be reviewed as part of the consultant's preparation and alignment process.

Additional public data and relevant internal context may be made available to the selected consultant as appropriate. However, MHR SB also expects the consultant's methodology to include meaningful community engagement, as direct input from community members, providers, system partners, and individuals with lived experience will be essential to understanding access barriers and identifying practical strategies for improvement.

Q9. Are there particular populations, neighborhoods, or lived-experience groups that MHR SB most wants centered in the community engagement process, especially among those not currently accessing care despite need?

A9. MHR SB wants the community engagement process to center individuals, families, and communities that have the greatest need for behavioral health services but may experience barriers to accessing care. This includes people with limited access to services, individuals who may not know where to seek help, and residents who are unaware of MHR SB, our role

in the community, or the broader network of provider partners and supports available through the local system of care.

MHR SB is especially interested in engagement strategies that reach beyond those who are already connected to services. The selected consultant should demonstrate the ability to hear from community members who are often underrepresented in planning processes, including those facing practical, cultural, geographic, financial, or informational barriers to care. The goal is to ensure that the Access in Action Plan reflects the experiences of those most impacted by access challenges and helps MHR SB strengthen pathways to care for the people who need services the most.

Q10. For the required community and consumer engagement component, are there any engagement formats, partner channels, or participation supports that MHR SB has found especially effective or ineffective in reaching harder-to-reach populations?

A10. MHR SB is not committed to a single engagement format or predetermined outreach model for this component. We are interested in reviewing the approach, strategy, creativity, and innovation that bidders bring forward to effectively engage community members, consumers, families, providers, and other relevant stakeholders.

Bidders should demonstrate their ability and experience in connecting with communities similar to ours, particularly individuals and groups that may be harder to reach through traditional engagement methods. Proposed approaches should reflect an understanding of community context, trusted communication channels, accessibility considerations, and modern engagement trends that may help reduce barriers to participation. MHR SB is especially interested in strategies that are practical, creative, community-informed, and capable of producing meaningful input from those most impacted by behavioral health access challenges.

Q 11. How would MHR SB like the selected consultant to balance internal, provider/system, and community voices when synthesizing findings into the final plan?

A11. MHR SB does not have a predetermined weighting or preferred formula for balancing internal, provider/system, and community voices in the final plan. Bidders should propose a clear and thoughtful methodology for gathering, analyzing, and synthesizing input across these stakeholder groups.

The selected consultant will be expected to ensure that the final Access in Action Plan reflects a balanced understanding of organizational priorities, provider and system-level realities, and the experiences of community members and consumers. MHR SB is especially interested in an approach that identifies areas of alignment, surfaces meaningful differences in perspective, and translates findings into practical recommendations, measurable outcomes, and a plan that can support long-term implementation.

Q12. For the communication and stigma-reduction strategy framework, does MHR SB already have preferred channels, audience segments, or campaign assets the consultant should build from, or should proposers assume a fresh design approach?

A12. Proposers should assume a fresh design approach for the communication and stigma-reduction strategy framework. MHR SB is interested in reviewing new ideas, creative strategies, and innovative methodologies that can strengthen our ability to reach the goals of the Access in Action Plan.

While existing MHR SB communications, public-facing materials, and community context may help inform the work, the Board is not asking proposers to simply build from a predetermined campaign structure or set of preferred channels. Proposed strategies should demonstrate thoughtful audience awareness, modern communication practices, and practical approaches for reducing stigma, increasing awareness, and improving access to services and supports.

Q13. For the success measurement framework, what reporting needs are most important to support Trustee decision-making while still moving beyond traditional compliance metrics?

A13. MHR SB is not prescribing a specific set of reporting measures or a predetermined measurement format for this component. Proposers should recommend a success measurement framework that reflects their expertise, best practices, and understanding of how to support meaningful decision-making by the Board of Trustees.

The framework should move beyond traditional compliance or activity-based metrics and help MHR SB understand progress, impact, and areas for continued improvement. Proposed measures should be practical, actionable, and capable of helping Trustees assess whether the Access in Action Plan is advancing its intended goals, improving

access to services, strengthening community reach, and supporting long-term system improvement.

MHR SB is looking to the selected consultant to help identify appropriate metrics, measurable outcomes, reporting tools, and recommended practices that can guide the Board and organization toward an effective pathway for implementation, accountability, and continuous improvement.

Q14. Since the RFP asks for detailed pricing but does not provide a budget ceiling, is there a target funding range MHR SB would be willing to share so proposers can appropriately calibrate scope, staffing, community engagement depth, and deliverable detail?

A14. MHR SB is not providing a target funding range or budget ceiling for this RFP. Proposers should submit detailed pricing that reflects the scope, staffing, methodology, community engagement approach, deliverables, and level of effort included in their proposal.

Pricing should be competitive, reasonable, and aligned with the services being proposed. MHR SB expects bidders to use their professional judgment and relevant experience with public-sector, government-led, or similarly situated organizations when developing their cost proposals. The Board will evaluate pricing in relation to the proposed scope of work, quality of approach, organizational qualifications, and overall value to MHR SB.

Q15. Are any deliverables expected to be conducted in person in Toledo, or is full virtual participation acceptable?

A15. MHR SB is open to proposals that include virtual, hybrid, or in-person methods for meetings, engagement activities, and project coordination. Full virtual participation is not automatically disqualifying; however, proposers should clearly explain how their proposed approach will support meaningful engagement, relationship-building, and successful completion of the stated deliverables.

MHR SB recognizes that some elements of the work may be effectively completed virtually, while other components may benefit from in-person participation or on-site engagement. Proposers are encouraged to recommend the format they believe will produce the strongest results while remaining mindful of cost effectiveness, project efficiency, and the needs of the communities and stakeholders being engaged.

The Board will evaluate proposed engagement formats in relation to the overall strength of the methodology, the ability to reach key audiences, the quality of the work plan, and the value of the proposed approach.