

2015 Request for Proposals Review Panel Guidelines and Instructions

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) 2015 Request for Proposals reviewing process. Your time and expertise help to strengthen this process. Please take a few minutes to become familiar with the following reviewer instructions.

OBJECTIVE

A major objective of the review process is reliability. Reliability deals with consistency: a reliable rating system is one that reaches the same conclusion each time in repeated observations of the same proposal. The Department undertook an analysis of the proposal review process utilized by its various divisions and made revisions to its departmental policies that are designed to promote greater uniformity and to ensure objectivity. As a result, these guidelines were developed to supplement your expertise and input in this process.

SCORING GUIDELINES

I. 2 CATEGORIES of SCORING:

A. "Basis for Scoring: Data"

- DHHS has established specific scoring thresholds for some items, which will be indicated in *italicized font with grey background* and can be disregarded during your review. These items will be indicated below as "Basis for Scoring: Data", and will indicate specific "Scoring Thresholds" for various responses.
- Scoring decisions will be based upon how well the applicant's response, or applicant related data provided by DHHS, satisfies a predetermined threshold for a particular score. These scores will be determined during the review panel meeting and do not need to be considered by individual reviewers beforehand.

B. "Basis for Scoring: Reviewer Judgment"

- In other instances, your "reviewer judgment" will determine the quality of the response. These items will be indicated below as "Basis for Scoring: Reviewer Judgment", and will be scored based on your estimation of how well the applicant's response satisfies the published requirements.
- Refer to the detail about each scoring category in this document, as well as the relevant program description described in the published Program Requirements (Section 5 of the RFP-to be provided) for the program you are reviewing to help define what "good" looks like for each criterion, and then consider the extent to which the applicant has provided evidence to support that criterion.
- Score only according to the criteria listed. Do not consider criteria other than the ones listed. For your convenience, under each scoring criterion below, an item and section reference is provided for you to identify where to find the applicant's response (See "Application Contents", in each application, for the table of contents), as well as the published requirement which establishes DHHS' expectations of what "good" looks like for the particular item.
- Do not consider any factors other than the response and the associated criteria in scoring proposals. Any direct experience you may have had with the applicant can be reflected in a separate scoring adjustment calculation for each criterion.

II. FACTORS TO CONSIDER WHEN SCORING POINTS:

- ✓ Assign points (0 to 5) according to the extent to which the response satisfies the published requirements. Individual scores will be reported and averaged for each applicant. The review panel meeting will attempt to reach consensus on an appropriate score for each criterion among panel members.

- ✓ As you are aware, uniformity and objectivity are critical to the review process. We request that reviewers apply criteria as consistently as possible across proposals. Prior to scoring a particular item, consider all of the evidence related to the applicant's response.
- ✓ As an example, if the applicant makes claims, they should be supported by evidence, such as facts or examples. The strongest evidence is prior performance. Prior performance must be illustrated with SPECIFIC and DETAILED examples of SUCCESSFUL performance, which provide detail supporting the criterion under consideration.
- ✓ Please do not give consideration to hypothetical responses as evidence of experience.
- ✓ Similarly, consider vague responses skeptically. Refrain from making inferences about the agency. For example, if the Agency does not include its mission statement, then the reviewer cannot determine whether or not the mission is aligned with DHHS' goals. If an item is not responded to, then it should be scored 0. The "Item and Section Reference" will indicate where the reviewer can expect to find the applicant's response to a particular item. If the reviewer does not find a response in the Item and Section Reference provided, the reviewer can consider that the applicant has not responded to that item. However, if the reviewer finds a response to an item in a section other than what has been indicated, the reviewer can score the item and should indicate where the response was found.
- ✓ Statements of belief do not constitute past or proposed services. For example, "*ABC Agency believes very strongly in the importance of cultural diversity. Strong cultural diversity promotes quality service delivery and a supportive work environment*". This is not a plan for developing cultural competence.

The scoring scale is as follows:

- 0 **Does not meet expectations.**
Score if response is missing, or if response satisfies none of the required elements.
- 1 **Meets very little of expectations.**
Proposed strategy satisfies very few required elements. Applicant has no previous experience with scored item.
- 2 **Meets fewer than half of expectations.**
Proposed strategy satisfies fewer than half of required elements. Applicant has no prior experience with scored item, or examples of previous experience are vague and lacking in detail.
- 3 **Meets at least half of expectations.**
Highest score possible if no specific examples of successful previous experience with scored item. This includes applicant reporting experience but not providing specific examples. Proposed strategy satisfies more than half of required elements.
- 4 **Meets all expectations.**
Must include specific examples of successful previous experience with scored item. Proposed strategy satisfies all required elements.
- 5 **Meets all expectations and Exceeds some expectations.**
Must include specific examples of successful previous experience with scored item. Proposed strategy satisfies all required elements and includes additional, non-required elements.

SCORE ADJUSTMENT

Reviewers can increase or decrease their overall score for a particular criterion by one point based on their previous experience with applicant, if applicable, **relating to the criterion under consideration**. This experience should be documented with a comment in the "Comments" section, to include both the criterion and sub criterion (i.e., 1.c. "Administrative Ability-Emergency Staffing Plan"), and the nature of the previous experience (such as, "as an employee of ABC Agency, I made crisis referrals to this agency and found them to be unresponsive").

The score adjustment will be made to the average score for the section. For example, Reviewer scores Section 1, Administrative Ability, as follows: Item a: 3, Item b: 4, Item c: 5. Average of Section 1 is 4. The final score for Section 1, Administrative Ability would be 3 (reflecting a score adjustment of -1), 4 (with no score adjustment), or 5 (reflecting a score adjustment of +1).

Reviewer:

Applicant:

Program Being Reviewed:

Contract Division (BHD, ESD, MSD, HD, DCSD, or DSD):

1. Administrative Ability

a. *On time and accuracy rate with prior year's required submissions, or shall be identified in the Performance Assessment as having met or exceeded expectations for "accurate submission of program reports" and "timely submission of program reports"-CSC will provide*

1) **Item and Section reference:** *N/A for agencies with a current, or within the last two years, contract with DHHS (CSC will provide); Item 30c or 30d for new applicants.*

2) **Basis for Scoring:** *Data provided by CSC. Score to be derived from on time and completeness of Audit, Monthly Revenue and Expense Statements, and Evaluation reports for applicants with existing contracts, or from rating assigned by assessor on performance assessment (if item is assigned a N/A or is not completed, score will be 0).*

3) **Scoring Thresholds:** *For full points, the total number of weeks late (over the previous year or a prorated period) for required reports will be fifteen or fewer. For four points, total number of weeks late for required reports will be seventeen or fewer. For three points, nineteen or fewer. For two points, 21 or fewer. For one point, 23 or fewer. For zero points, more than 23.*

SCORE (0-5): *to be determined at consensus meeting*

b. *Accuracy and completeness of proposal-proposal contains all required elements which do not correspond to specific scoring criteria-CSC will provide*

1) **Item and Section reference:** *N/A*

2) **Basis for Scoring:** *Data provided by CSC.*

3) **Scoring Thresholds:** *Reduce score by one point for each omitted item, and/or one half point for each item submitted on old forms, incomplete, or not according to directions.*

SCORE (0-5): *to be determined at consensus meeting*

c. **Emergency Management Plan**

1) **Item and Section reference:** *Item 24*

2) **Basis for Scoring:** *Narrative, Reviewer judgment of applicant's description of agency's Emergency Management Plan. For five 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. For four points, Plan includes all required elements, but has not been tested and/or has no example of formal arrangements for continuity of operations. For three points, plan includes at least 11 of 16 required elements; for two points, at least 8; for one point, at least 4, for 0 points, fewer than four.*

SCORE (0-5): _____

d. **Score adjustment based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with applicant relating to these criteria.**

SCORE (if applicable, +/- 1 point): _____

Comments (cite criterion and/or sub-criterion and the specific experience which reviewer has had with applicant): _____

2. Budget Justification

c. Proposed Cost for Delivery of Service Compares favorably to Other Applicants.

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 27.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Data provided by Accounting or CA Staff. Score to be derived from ratio of Total costs proposed (Total program budget)/total units of service proposed.
- 3) **Scoring Thresholds:** (Lowest rate of all applicants/rate of applicant under consideration) x 5=score.
SCORE (0-5): to be determined at consensus meeting

d. Bonus point (if applicable): Applicant proposes more than 12.5% of total program costs to be supported with contributions or unrestricted grant. Score to be derived from ratio of Contributions and Donations (Form 5A, account #4000)/total program budget.

SCORE (+ 1 point, if applicable) _____

3. Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competence

a. Appropriate representation of racial and cultural minorities in board and staff relative to the representation of racial and cultural minorities in the projected target population.

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 5 (board representation), Item 27 (Form 2B staff representation), Item 36 (projected target population)
- 4) **Basis for Scoring:** Data provided by applicant; calculations to be provided by CSC.
- 5) **Scoring Thresholds:** Ratio of minorities in board or staff exceeds ratio of minorities in target population-5, ratio of minorities in board or staff equal to ratio of minorities in target population-4, ratio of minorities in board or staff greater than 75% of ratio of minorities in target population-3, ratio of minorities in board or staff greater than 50% of ratio of minorities in target population-2, ratio of minorities in board or staff less than 50% of ratio of minorities in target population-1.
SCORE (0-5): to be determined at consensus meeting

b. Plan for developing Cultural Competence

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 23.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Narrative, Reviewer judgment of "proposed methods for developing and maintaining Cultural Competence as well as the applicant's history of performance in this area. Applicant must provide specific examples of existing and/or proposed policies, procedures, and other practices, if any, which promote Cultural Competence. For full points, applicant 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."

SCORE (0-5): _____

c. Score adjustment based on action(s) taken within the previous year geared toward increasing board or staff diversity.

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 23.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Narrative, Reviewer Judgment. Narrative contains a specific example, with documentation, if appropriate, of actions taken within the previous year geared toward increasing board and/or staff diversity.

SCORE (1 if present): _____

4

- d. Score adjustment based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with applicant relating to these criteria.

SCORE (if applicable, +/- 1 point): _____

Comments (cite criterion and/or sub-criterion and the specific experience which reviewer has had with applicant): _____

4. Previous Experience

- a. Applicant demonstrates experience with current or recent contracts in terms of: 1) program volume, 2) target population, 3) dollar amount of contract, and 4) services provided. CSC will provide supporting data.

1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 29b, 29c, 29d

2) **Basis for Scoring:** Data, Narrative, and Reviewer judgment of "Past Service Experience with similar contracts. Similarity to be measured by looking at specific, detailed examples of current or recent contracts in terms of: 1) program volume, 2) target population, 3) dollar amount of contract, and 4) service mix (types of services offered). For full points, applicant currently operates a program which meets or exceeds these four criteria." For new applicants, reviewer to consider assessor responses to Performance Assessment questions about these four criteria.

3) **Scoring Thresholds:** For full points, applicant must have at least three years' experience in each of these four areas. For four points, at least two years' in each area. For three points, at least one years'. For two points, some experience, but less than one year. For zero points, applicant has no previous experience with these four areas. If applicant has experience, but not in all four areas, one point shall be deducted for the number of areas with no experience. (Example: applicant has three years of experience operating a program with same program volume, target population, dollar amount of contract, but not service mix-score would be 5-1 or 4).

SCORE (0-5): _____

- b) Score adjustment based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with applicant relating to these criteria.

SCORE (if applicable, +/- 1 point): _____

Comments (cite criterion and/or sub-criterion and the specific experience which reviewer has had with applicant): _____

5. Outcomes and Quality Assurance

- a. Applicants with existing contracts have submitted prior period's evaluation report on time and with all required elements. Applicants without existing contracts have been identified on Item

29c or 29d as meeting or exceeding expectations for "Timely submission of program reports" and "Accurate submission of program reports"

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Items 29c or 29d as applicable
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Data provided by CSC.
- 3) **Scoring Thresholds:** For applicants with current contracts, composite percentage score from prior period evaluation review scorecard times 5. For applicants without current contracts, score of $(("Achievement of established outcomes") + ("Timely submission of program reports") + ("Accurate submission of program reports")) / 3$

SCORE (0-5): _____

- b. Score adjustment based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with applicant relating to these criteria.

SCORE (if applicable, +/- 1 point): _____

Comments (cite criterion and/or sub-criterion and the specific experience which reviewer has had with applicant): _____

6. Service Plan and Delivery

- a. Consistency with program objectives as defined by DHHS in the Year 2015 Purchase of Service Guidelines Program Requirements and the contract agency.

4) **Item and Section reference:** Program Requirements, Item 29a, 29b

5) **Basis for Scoring:** Narrative, reviewer judgment.

SCORE (0-5): _____

- b. The applicant has a clear and distinct mission statement for its agency which is aligned with that of the contract division applied to.

1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 8 (for applicant's response), Program Description (for contract division applied to-will be provided) as it is stated or inferred by the reviewer.

2) **Basis for Scoring:** Narrative, Reviewer judgment of proposal.

SCORE (0-5): _____

- c. Score adjustment based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with applicant relating to these criteria.

SCORE (if applicable, +/- 1 point): _____

Comments (cite criterion and/or sub-criterion and the specific experience which reviewer has had with applicant): _____

7. Staffing Plan

- a. Quality of proposal to provide effective staffing and agency oversight, including board review and direct service staff supervision.

1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 9; Item 28, Item 32

2) **Basis for Scoring:** Narrative, Reviewer judgment.

SCORE (0-5): _____

b. Staffing levels are adequate

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 27, Item 36.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Data to be provided by applicant, calculations to be provided by CSC. Score to be derived from ratio of total number of FTE direct service staff proposed (as defined by employee categories 7002 and 7004 per form 2)/ total proposed number of clients served (as defined on Item 36, Client Characteristic Chart)
- 3) **Scoring Thresholds:** (Score of applicant under consideration/Highest Score of all applicants) x 5 =score.

SCORE (0-5): to be determined at consensus meeting

c. Staff are licensed and certified as appropriate, or meet other required qualifications.

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 34.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Narrative and Reviewer judgment.

SCORE (0-5): _____

d. Direct service staff are appropriately experienced.

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 34.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Narrative and Reviewer judgment.

SCORE (0-5): _____

e. Applicant's turnover rate of direct service staff and training for direct service staff compares favorably to the other applicants' proposals:

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 33.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Data provided by applicant, calculations to be provided by CSC. Score to be derived from ratio of Total number of separations from this position in the prior twelve months/average number of employees in the position during the same period.
- 3) **Scoring Thresholds:** (Lowest score of all applicants/score of applicant under consideration) x 5 =score.

SCORE (0-5): to be determined at consensus meeting

f. Applicant's availability of training for direct service staff compares favorably to other applicants' proposals

- 1) **Item and Section Reference:** Item 33.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Data provided by applicant, calculations provided by CSC. Score to be derived from dollar value of tuition reimbursement offered.
- 3) **Scoring Thresholds:** (Amount of tuition benefit offered per employee annually, in dollars, for applicant under consideration/highest amount of all applicants) x 5 =score.

SCORE (0-5): to be determined at consensus meeting

g. Applicant's quantity of in-service training utilized by direct service staff during the previous year

- 1) **Item and Section reference:** Item 34.
- 2) **Basis for Scoring:** Data provided by applicant, calculations provided by CSC. Score to be derived from average number, in hours, of program related in-service training completed per direct service employee in the previous year.
- 3) **Scoring Thresholds:** (Average of applicant under consideration/highest of applicants) x 5 =score.

SCORE (0-5): to be determined at consensus meeting

- h. **Bonus point (if applicable): Applicant meets or exceeds living wage of \$11.47 per hour for all wages and salaries budgeted for proposed program, as derived from Item 27, Form 2, 2A, using column 4 "yearly salary" figures/2080.**

SCORE (+ .5 point, if applicable) _____

- i. Score adjustment based on reviewers' prior experience, if applicable, with applicant relating to these criteria.

SCORE (if applicable, +/- 1 point): _____

Comments (cite criterion and/or sub-criterion and the specific experience which reviewer has had with applicant): _____
