

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM
RFP 2018-0500-3793
MEHS STUDENT DORMITORY MANAGEMENT AND STUDENT SUPERVISORY SERVICES

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 (8 PERCENT)

A: MAX SCORE OF 50 POINTS

B: TOTAL POINTS THIS SECTION: _____

$(B/A) \times 8 =$ 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. How well does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the eight parent services described in the RFP?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

5. 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 (24 PERCENT)

A: MAX SCORE OF 90 POINTS

B: TOTAL POINTS THIS SECTION: _____

$(B/A) \times 24 =$ SCORE FOR THIS SECTION _____

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

1. How well does the contractor staffing plan meet the objectives of coverage?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

2. How well does the contractor proposal include ideas and plans to maintain a high quality of life and activity for the residence?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

3. How well does the contractor plan cover safety and management needs of residential students?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

4. How well does the proposed staff training plan ensure a high quality of knowledge and skills?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

5. 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:

6. How well does the methodology represent an understanding of the nature of the job and the developmental needs of teenage students

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

Evaluator's Notes:

7. 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:

8. How well 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:

9. How well does the methodology support the provision of the eight parent services described 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 (24 PERCENT)

A: Max Score of 130 Points

B: Total Points this section: _____

(B/A) x 24= 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 does the staffing plan allow for appropriate supervision and chain of command?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

3. How well does the proposal allow line staff to share information so that supervisory staff are fully informed on activities and interactions directly involving students?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

4. How likely is the proposal plan to lead to collaboration and team management between contract and state staff?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

5. How well does the proposal's Management Plan include creative, student-centered activities and program services?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

6. To what extent does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the MEHS students?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

7. 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:

8. 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:

9. 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:

10. Does the Management Plan provide a plan that involves MEHS students in custodial duties?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

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

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

Evaluator's Notes:

12. Is the staffing plan and organization of the project team clear?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

13. How well does the proposal illustrate the lines of authority, communication and accountability?

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

Evaluator's Notes:

5.04 EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS (12 PERCENT)

A: Max Score of 60 Points

B: Total Points this section: _____

$(B/A) \times 12 = \text{Score For This Section}$ _____

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

a) Questions regarding the personnel:

1. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

Score ☐ 1 (Do not have the experience)

☐ 5 (Adequate experience)

☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

2. Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the project requires?

Score ☐ 1 (Not desirable or incomplete)

☐ 5 (Minimally desirable and complete)

☐ 10 (Very desirable and complete)

Evaluator's Notes:

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

Score ☐ 1 (Not extensive or not hired)

☐ 5 (Minimally extensive, applicable, and hired)

☐ 10 (Very extensive, applicable, and hired)

Evaluator's Notes:

b) Questions regarding the firm:

4. How well has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects with high quality satisfaction?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)

☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)

☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

5. 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:

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

- Score ☐ 1 (No)
☐ 5 (Yes, but prior clients not relevant)
☐ 10 (Yes, prior clients relevant)

Evaluator's Notes:

7. If a subcontractor will perform work on the contract, how well do they measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

- Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate or does **not** use subcontractors)

Evaluator's Notes:

THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS WILL BE SCORED BY THE PROCUREMENT OFFICER

5.05 Contract Cost (22 Percent/22 Points)

Overall, a maximum of 22% 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: _____