



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Milwaukee County

Hector Colon, Director

May 7, 2015

Mr. Gerard Randall and Mr. George Hinton
Social Development Commission
4041 N. Richards Street
Milwaukee, WI 53212

Delivered via email to George P. Hinton at: ghinton@cr-sdc.org
Original to follow in U.S. Mail

Re: Notice of Intent to Award Energy Assistance Contract

Dear Mr. Randall and Mr. Hinton,

We received your letter requesting further information regarding the determination of the Intent to Award for RFP #82110001 for the Management Services Division (MSD) on May 6, 2015.

Per your request for the reasons for our determination, pursuant to Section 110.04 of the Milwaukee County Ordinances, we are providing you with your proposal scores (attachments 1-6), the criteria used for each of the 7 areas evaluated (attachment 7) and the final cumulative scores for each proposer in each zone (attachment 8).

All Department of Health and Human Service (DHHS) Purchase of Service contract proposals are evaluated using the same objective criteria, including administrative ability, budget justification, cultural diversity and competence, previous experience, outcomes and quality assurance, service plan and delivery, and staff planning. Each sub-criteria is rated on a scale from 1 to 5 to ensure quality, value and experience are just as measurable as cost.

Scores for staffing levels, staff diversity, training opportunities and administration are objectively calculated based on data in your submissions of budget, staff rosters and staff requirements. Scores were based upon how well your response, or related data, satisfied predetermined thresholds for a particular scoring criterion.

In other instances, reviewer judgment was used to determine the quality of your response and your response was scored based on the reviewer's estimation of how well your response satisfied the published requirements. Reviewers were instructed not to consider any factors other than the response and the associated published criteria in scoring proposals.

The panel evaluating the proposals was comprised of a diverse group of county staff and community participants familiar with the WHEAP program and the community we serve. In addition, the cost proposals were evaluated by an independent CPA.

Cost is one of the evaluation categories listed in the RFP and represents just thirteen (13) percentage of the total possible points in the RFP evaluation. Calculation of points awarded to the lowest cost proposer and each subsequent proposal used the lowest dollar proposed

amount as a constant numerator and the dollar amount of the proposer being scored as the denominator.

The result then was multiplied by the total number of points provided in the cost section of the RFP (130 out of 1,000). The lowest cost proposal received the maximum number of points available for each zone for the cost category. Other cost proposals received prorated scores based on the proportion that the costs of the proposals varied from the lowest cost proposal.

The evaluation committee's scoring was tabulated and proposals were ranked based on the total numerical scores, comprising the sum of both technical and cost scoring for each zone. Based upon the weighted cost and technical evaluation criteria as set forth in the RFP, Section 4, Part 4, your proposal was determined not to be the most advantageous to the county. Based on these criteria, Social Development Commission was not the highest scoring bidder in any zone.

In zones for which there were only two proposers, the contract was awarded to the highest scoring proposer. In zones for which there were more than two proposers, we recommend either the first or second highest scoring proposer, Community Advocates or UMOS.

Sincerely,



Dennis Buesing
Contract Administrator
Milwaukee County Department of Health and Human Services

Enclosures (8)

cc: Hector Colon, Milwaukee County
Jeanne Dorff, Milwaukee County
Diane Gallegos, Milwaukee County
Sumanish Kalia, Milwaukee County

PROPOSAL SCORING WORKSHEET (SUMMARY)

Reviewer: Average Score

Applicant:	SDC	
Program:	WHEAP Zone 1	
Contract Division:	MSD	Max Score

1 Administrative Ability FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 1	120	64.00
2 Budget Justification FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 2	130	30.94
3 Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 3	90	78.75
4 Previous Experience FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 4	130	117.00
5 Outcomes and Quality Assurance FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 6	130	123.50
6 Service Plan and Delivery FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 7	280	189.00
7 Staffing Plan FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 8	120	81.54
TOTAL SCORE, ALL SECTIONS	1000	664.73

PROPOSAL SCORING WORKSHEET (SUMMARY)

Average Score 4

Reviewer:	
Applicant:	SDC
Program:	WHEAP zone 2
Contract Division:	MSD
	Max Score

1 Administrative Ability FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 1	120	64.00
2 Budget Justification FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 2	130	31.55
3 Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 3	90	78.75
4 Previous Experience FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 4	130	117.00
5 Outcomes and Quality Assurance FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 6	130	123.50
6 Service Plan and Delivery FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 7	280	196.00
7 Staffing Plan FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 8	120	63.33
TOTAL SCORE, ALL SECTIONS	1000	674.12

PROPOSAL SCORING WORKSHEET (SUMMARY)

Average Score 4

Reviewer:	
Applicant:	SDC
Program:	WHEAP zone 3
Contract Division:	MSD
	Max Score

1 Administrative Ability FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 1	120	76.00
2 Budget Justification FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 2	130	36.92
3 Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 3	90	78.75
4 Previous Experience FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 4	130	117.00
5 Outcomes and Quality Assurance FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 6	130	123.50
6 Service Plan and Delivery FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 7	280	210.00
7 Staffing Plan FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 8	120	59.78
TOTAL SCORE, ALL SECTIONS	1000	701.90

PROPOSAL SCORING WORKSHEET (SUMMARY)

Reviewer: Average Score
4

Applicant:	SDC
Program:	WHEAP zone 4
Contract Division:	MSD
	Max Score

1 Administrative Ability FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 1	120	64.00
2 Budget Justification FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 2	130	25.31
3 Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 3	90	78.75
4 Previous Experience FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 4	130	117.00
5 Outcomes and Quality Assurance FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 6	130	123.50
6 Service Plan and Delivery FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 7	280	217.00
7 Staffing Plan FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 8	120	63.74
TOTAL SCORE, ALL SECTIONS	1000	659.29

PROPOSAL SCORING WORKSHEET (SUMMARY)

Average Score

Reviewer:	
Applicant:	SDC
Program:	WHEAP zone 5
Contract Division:	MSD
	Max Score

1 Administrative Ability FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 1	120	64.00
2 Budget Justification FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 2	130	42.21
3 Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 3	90	78.75
4 Previous Experience FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 4	130	117.00
5 Outcomes and Quality Assurance FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 6	130	123.50
6 Service Plan and Delivery FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 7	280	196.00
7 Staffing Plan FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 8	120	62.37
TOTAL SCORE, ALL SECTIONS	1000	683.62

PROPOSAL SCORING WORKSHEET (SUMMARY)

Average Score

Reviewer:	
Applicant:	SDC
Program:	WHEAP zone 6
Contract Division:	MSD
	Max Score

1 Administrative Ability FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 1	120	64.00
2 Budget Justification FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 2	130	43.33
3 Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 3	90	78.75
4 Previous Experience FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 4	130	117.00
5 Outcomes and Quality Assurance FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 6	130	123.50
6 Service Plan and Delivery FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 7	280	217.00
7 Staffing Plan FINAL SCORE FOR SECTION 8	120	62.64
TOTAL SCORE, ALL SECTIONS	1000	706.22

Eval #	Letter	zone 1			zone 2			zone 3			zone 4			zone 5			zone 6		
		CA	SDC	UMOS	CA	SDC	UMOS	CA	ESI	SDC	UMOS	CA	ESI	SDC	UMOS	CA	ESI	SDC	UMOS
1	A	854.19	659.34	766.73	826.19	688.02	766.73	851.24	711.90	761.45	766.90	526.07	700.29	766.56	760.57	532.29	699.97	721.84	
2	B	888.19	752.48	823.02	888.19	753.16	823.02	885.24	749.04	817.74	825.47	656.35	734.00	822.85	847.14	590.72	761.69	774.70	
3	C	815.90	602.77	760.52	819.90	603.44	760.52	821.96	599.33	773.24	818.61	708.28	615.72	744.64	812.28	282.29	615.40	715.63	
4	D	883.33	644.34	808.02	901.33	651.87	808.02	874.33	696.90	820.74	843.04	663.92	685.29	825.85	798.42	614.15	747.83	763.13	
	total	860.40	664.73	789.57	858.90	674.12	789.57	858.19	689.29	793.29	813.51	638.66	683.82	789.98	804.60	504.86	706.22	743.83	
	high																		
	low																		

attachment 7

Attachment 8

III. Proposal Review and Scoring Criteria for ALL contract divisions

A. **Administrative Ability - 12 percent.** The Proposer demonstrates evidence of administrative capacity to meet federal, state, county and creditor requirements, including timeliness of required submissions and payment of obligations. Proposer demonstrates an ability to provide timely and accurate monthly client and financial reports. Proposer demonstrates an ability to be responsive to crisis situations, including, but not limited to, variations in client referral volume and serving exceptional cases.

In scoring proposals, for agencies currently under contract with DHHS, reviewers will consider the on time and accuracy rate of Proposer in prior year's required submissions. For new Proposers, reviewers will consider the on time and accuracy rate of Proposer as described by the person providing the required Experience Assessment report (item 29c or 29d). Existing proposers will be rated on the most current evaluation report (item 29e). Additionally, in scoring proposals for Administrative Ability, reviewers will consider the accuracy and completeness of the proposal. Inaccurate or incomplete proposals will receive reduced scores.

In scoring Administrative Ability, reviewers will consider the size, structure, experience, and independence of the board of directors and officers.

The Proposer demonstrates comprehensive emergency preparedness. For full points, Proposer has an existing emergency management plan which includes all required elements, has been tested, and includes specific examples of memoranda of agreement or other formal arrangements for continuity of operations, client care, etc.

Administrative Ability will also be scored based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with Proposer relating to these criteria.

B. **Budget Justification - 13 percent.** The Proposer provides a budget that is accurate, clear, and in sufficient detail. The budget effectively and efficiently supports the level of service, staffing, and the proposed program. The Proposer's proposed cost to deliver the service, compared to other Proposers, reflects the quality and quantity of service to be provided. The reviewer's analysis will include: unit cost comparisons and/or budget overview, total number of units of service to be provided, any limitations on the total number of clients to be served during the contract period.

Budget Justification will also be scored based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with Proposer relating to these criteria.

C. **Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence - 9 percent.** The program takes actions that show its commitment to the goals of cultural diversity and cultural competence in the workplace, including diversity in staffing practices and Board/committee composition as well as serving a culturally diverse population in a culturally competent manner.

In evaluating Cultural Diversity in proposals, reviewers will consider the representation of racial and cultural minorities in board and staff relative to the representation of racial and cultural minorities in the projected target population, as measured by data on forms Board of Directors, Owners, Stockholders Demographic Summary (Item 5), Client Characteristic Chart (Item 36)

and Employee Demographics Summary (Form 2B, Item 27). For full points, Proposer must demonstrate a ratio of board and staff which is greater than or equal to the ratio of racial and cultural minorities in the projected target population. If Proposer receives less than full points for this item, one point will be added to the score if the Proposer can demonstrate proof of specific action(s) taken within the previous year geared toward increasing board or staff diversity. The action(s) taken must be supported with documentation.

In evaluating Cultural Competence in proposals, reviewers will consider the Proposer's proposed methods for developing and maintaining Cultural Competence as well as the Proposer's history of performance in this area. (Item 23) Proposer must provide specific examples of existing and/or proposed policies, procedures, and other practices, if any, which promote Cultural Competence. For full points, Proposer will have a history of promoting Cultural Competence. Examples of acceptable policies, procedures, and practices can include, but are not limited to: providing in service or other training, or involvement of consumers in policy-making, planning, service delivery, and/or evaluation.

Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence will also be scored based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with Proposer relating to these criteria.

D. Previous Experience – 13 Percent. The Proposer's experience demonstrates the ability to provide the proposed service to the target group. For Proposers without prior Milwaukee County experience, information will be gathered from Performance Assessments provided by the Proposer following a prescribed format. Documented non-performance or noncompliance under previous contracts will be taken into consideration.

In evaluating experience in proposals, reviewers will consider:

Past Service Experience with similar contracts. Similarity to be measured by looking at specific, detailed examples of successful current or recent contracts in terms of: 1) program volume, 2) target population, 3) dollar amount of contract, and 4) service mix. For full points, Proposer currently successfully operates a program which meets or exceeds these four criteria. In evaluating "success" reviewers will consider the content of evaluation and other program reports, as well as Quality Assurance findings and corrective action plans, as applicable.

Previous Experience will also be scored based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with Proposer relating to these criteria.

E. Outcomes and Quality Assurance – 13 Percent. For Proposers with a current or recent County contract, scoring will be based on compliance with submission deadline, required content and overall findings of program evaluation reports for most current contract period, and findings from site audits or any other program or contract noncompliance based on other Quality Assurance reviews (item 29e). For new Proposers or Proposers without a current DHHS contract within the last two years, scores will be derived from item 29c or 29d as applicable.

Outcomes and Quality Assurance will also be scored based on reviewers' prior experience with Proposer, if applicable relating to these criteria.

F. Service Plan and Delivery – 28 Percent.

Review and scoring and scoring of the Service Delivery Plan will consider its:

- Consistency with program objectives as defined by DHHS in the Year 2015 Purchase of Service Guidelines Program Requirements and the contract agency.
- Rationale and theories supporting the program activities. Proposers should use research or other evidence-based support for their program model.

There is a performance improvement plan, which includes measurement of outcomes, and demonstrated use of performance information to improve services and program management. For full points, Proposer must describe service delivery in terms of inputs, processes, outputs, and outcomes, and indicators as described in Items 29a and b.

The agency mission statement (item 8) is shown to be consistent with the Division's or program's mission, values or goals.

Agency either owns service site or has a current lease which expires no earlier than the ending date of the current contract period.

Service Delivery Plan will also be scored based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with Proposer relating to these criteria.

G. Staffing Plan – 12 Percent. The Proposer demonstrates an ability to provide effective staffing and agency oversight, including board review and direct service staff supervision. Staffing levels are adequate, and staff is adequately compensated. Staff are licensed and certified as appropriate, or meet other required qualifications. Direct service staff is appropriately experienced. Proposer's turnover rate of direct service staff and training for direct service staff will be compared and ranked against the other Proposers' proposals. Compensation of lowest paid staff will be compared and ranked against the other Proposers' proposals.

Proposer must include average years of experience and turnover rate for direct service staff. For new agencies without a prior contracting history of any kind, Proposer must indicate the required years of experience for direct service staff proposed for the program. Proposer must indicate what type of training is available to staff, including in-service training, tuition reimbursement (if applicable) benefits and utilization, and other training activities such as conference attendance, etc. For full points, Proposer must indicate the specific type and quantity of training available and utilized by direct service staff during the previous year, and the type and quantity is appropriate.

Staffing Plan will also be scored based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with Proposer relating to these criteria.