

STATE OF GEORGIA

State Commission on the Efficacy of the CON Program

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Request for Proposal

RFP Number 41900-001-0000000040

Healthcare Data and Analytical Consultant

CONFIDENTIALITY

Throughout the evaluation process, the confidentiality and security of the proposers' proposals and the scoring process must be maintained. Neither Commission members nor Department staff shall contact representatives from the two proposers.

EVALUATION PROCESS

OVERVIEW

This chapter provides an overview of the CON Commission consultant evaluation process. It follows the process from proposal receipt to final contract award. The process itself is divided into five separate phases. These phases, which are described in the following sections of this chapter, are:

Phase 1—Evaluation of Mandatory Requirements of Technical Proposals

Phase 2—Support Staff Review of Technical Proposals

Phase 3—Commission Member Evaluation of Proposals

Phase 4—Presentations by Proposers

Phase 5—Re-Consideration of Proposals

Phase 6—Evaluation of Cost Proposals

Phase 7—Ranking of Proposals

PHASE 1: EVALUATION OF MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

The purpose of this phase is to determine if each technical proposal is sufficiently responsive to the RFP to permit a complete evaluation of the proposal. Following the due date and time, proposals will be reviewed by the support staff for all mandatory items on a pass or fail basis. Proposals that receive a fail score on any item(s) will be rejected by the Department support staff. The Commission reserves the right to reject any and all proposals and to waive minor

irregularities. Only those proposals passing all mandatory requirements will be submitted for a complete technical evaluation.

PHASE 2: SUPPORT STAFF REVIEW OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

The purpose of this phase is for Department of Community Health Support Staff to review the proposals and summarize them for the CON Commission. After completion of Phase 1, the DCH Support Staff will begin reviewing the technical proposals that passed mandatory requirements. In a closed session meeting of the CON Commission, the support staff will present its summary of the proposals.

Reference Checks

The purpose of contacting references is to verify both the corporate and business capabilities of the proposer and the qualifications of proposed professional staff. Reference check questions will emphasize performance as well as experience.

Reference checks will be done by telephone. Designated Department support staff will contact the customer references identified by the proposer. The results of the telephone contacts will be compiled in writing and provided to the CON Commission at the closed session meeting to assist it in scoring specific questions.

PHASE 3: COMMISSION MEMBER EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

In a closed session, the Commission shall evaluate the sufficiency of each proposal using a technical evaluation scoring tool. The Commission will reach consensus as to the score to be awarded for each section and each question. A maximum of 650 points will be awarded for the technical score.

Scoring

The following four major sections in the technical proposal are evaluated separately based on pre-established criteria:

- Company Background and Experience
- Staff Qualifications and Experience
- Project Approach/Methodology
- Work Plan & Project Schedule
- Proposed Deliverables
- References

PHASE 4: PRESENTATION BY PROPOSERS

After the CON Commission has reached an initial consensus score on the proposals, each proposer will be asked in term to make a presentation to the Commission members in closed session. Presentations provide Commission member evaluators with an opportunity to obtain answers to questions raised during the review of proposals and reference checks and to finalize conclusions regarding the abilities of the proposed personnel.

Any proposer which is clearly not qualified (did not pass the mandatory checklist) will not be invited to a presentation.

PHASE 5: RE-CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS

After the proposer presentations, the CON Commission may wish to adjust scores it had previously awarded in Phase 3. For example, if it is the consensus of the Commission members that the presentation answers revealed that a score originally given was too high, the score may be adjusted downward. During this re-consideration, scores may not be adjusted upward. This score reached by consensus of the Commission members in closed session after presentations shall serve as the final technical evaluation score.

PHASE 6: EVALUATION OF COST PROPOSALS

A maximum of 350 points will be awarded for cost. The Cost Proposals will be kept confidential and will not be made available to the Department support staff nor the Commission member evaluators until after scores have been issued for the technical proposals.

PHASE 7: RANKING OF PROPOSALS

After the cost proposals have been scored, the points awarded to the cost proposals will be added to the points awarded to the respective technical proposals to determine the final ranking. This final ranking and pertinent supporting materials will be used to make the recommendation of the winning contractor. Immediately after all CON Commission approvals are obtained, the CON Commission or the Department support staff will notify all proposers of the decision.

SUPPORT STAFF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Technical proposals shall be evaluated by consensus of the CON Commission against pre-established criteria to measure their individual merits and responsiveness to RFP requirements in each of several areas. Evaluation criteria are grouped into four categories, each of which will be discussed further in this section. The following shows the maximum number of points that may be awarded by section:

	Points
Category 1 - Corporate Background and Experience	110
Category 2 – Staff Qualifications and Experience	110
Category 3 – Project Approach and Methodology	140
Category 4 – Work Plan and Project Schedule	50
Category 5 – Proposed Deliverables	140
Category 6 – References	100

Evaluation questions have been developed for each category. They are presented in the remainder of this chapter. Considerations in determining an evaluation score are listed under each question. Items for consideration are not an all-inclusive list.

Each question will have a raw score assigned to it. There is a separate scoring sheet for each question related to the criteria being evaluated. Scores will be assigned from a range of 0 to 4 as defined below:

0	<u>No Value:</u>	The proposer has omitted a response to this requirement or has not established the capability to perform the requirement or the reference checks indicate that the proposer is incapable of performing the requirement.
1	<u>Poor:</u>	The proposer has responded to the requirement, but the proposal or the reference check presents no convincing capability to meet the requirement or the capability is only marginally described
2	<u>Inadequate:</u>	The proposal lacks adequate details of capability to perform and approach as only sufficient.
3	<u>Good:</u>	The proposal or the reference check has provided information to establish performance qualifications that meets the requirements of the RFP.
4	<u>Excellent:</u>	The proposal has provided innovation or details in the approach to highly meet requirements, or references and/or proposal demonstrates superb capability in this area.

Each question must be scored. Each score must be a value from the 0 to 4. Fractional values will not be accepted, and any missing scores will be returned for scoring. Scoring should reflect the proposer's overall response or the reference check responses to each criterion. Scoring choices within a range should reflect either a positive or negative impression of the quality of the proposer's overall approach to that area. For each criterion, there is a series of questions or topics listed for evaluation. Each question has one or more considerations to assist the evaluator.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY SCORE SHEET

PROPOSER	TOTAL TECHNICAL PROPOSAL POINTS (P)	PRORATED TECHNICAL SCORE (P/Hx650)

H=Highest Total Technical Proposal Points Awarded