

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM**  
**RFP 2017-0500-3589**  
**A School Library Consultant to Assist Alaska's School Library Staff**

ALL PROPOSALS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR RESPONSIVENESS  
THEN EVALUATED USING THE CRITERIA SET OUT HEREIN.

Person or Firm Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of PEC Member \_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Review \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION CRITERIA AND CONTRACTOR SELECTION**

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS PROPOSAL IS 100

**5.01 UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT (15 PERCENT)**

A: MAX SCORE OF 40 POINTS

B: TOTAL POINTS THIS SECTION: .

(B/A) X 15= SCORE FOR THIS SECTION \_\_\_\_\_

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

1. How well has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

2. How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

3. To what degree has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the state expects it to provide?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

4. Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the state's time schedule and can meet it?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

**5.02 METHODOLOGY USED FOR THE PROJECT (10 PERCENT)**

A: MAX SCORE OF 30 POINTS

B: TOTAL POINTS THIS SECTION: .

(B/A) X 10= SCORE FOR THIS SECTION \_\_\_\_\_

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

1. How comprehensive is the methodology and does it depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

2. How well does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

3. Does the methodology interface with the time schedule in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

### 5.03 MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE PROJECT (10 PERCENT)

A: Max Score of 80 Points

B: Total Points this section:

$(B/A) \times 10 =$  Score For This Section

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

1. How well does the management plan support all of the project requirements and logically lead to the deliverables required in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

2. How well is accountability completely and clearly defined?[Is the organization of the project team clear?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

3. Is the organization of the project team clear?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

4. How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and communication?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

5. To what extent does the offeror already have the hardware, software, equipment, and licenses necessary to perform the contract?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

6. Does it appear that the offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

7. Has the offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

8. To what degree is the proposal practical and feasible?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

9. To what extent has the offeror identified potential problems?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

#### 5.04 EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS (15 PERCENT)

A: Max Score of 60 Points

B: Total Points this section:

$(B/A) \times 20 =$  Score For This Section

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

*Questions regarding the personnel:*

1. Does the contractor have experience on similar projects?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

2. How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the contractor to work on the project?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

3. How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

4. How well do the personnel designated to work on the project meet the desired experience described in §4.11?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

Questions regarding the firm:

5. How well has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

6. How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

7. Has the firm provided letters of reference from previous clients?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)  
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)  
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

---

---

**THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS WILL BE SCORED BY THE PROCUREMENT OFFICER**

**5.05 Contract Cost (40 Percent/40 Points)**

Overall, a maximum of 40% of the total evaluation points will be assigned to cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by one or more of the preferences referenced under Section 6.

Converting Cost to Points: The lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined through the method set out in Section 6.15.

**TOTAL SCORE THIS SECTION:** \_\_\_\_\_

**5.06 Alaska Offeror Preference (10 Percent/10 Points)**

If an offeror qualifies for the Alaska Bidder Preference, the offeror will receive an Alaska Offeror Preference. The preference will be 10 percent of the total available points. This amount will be added to the overall evaluation score of each Alaskan offeror.

**TOTAL SCORE THIS SECTION:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE:**