

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Administration
Division of Motor Vehicles



Statewide Salary Study RFP#2024-0200-0120-02-103-24

Amendment # One

ISSUE DATE: September 26, 2023

This amendment is being issued for *questions and answers and changes*.

Important Note to Offerors: You must sign and return this page of the amendment document with your proposal. Failure to do so may result in the rejection of your proposal. Only the RFP terms and conditions referenced in this amendment are being changed. All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain the same.

CHRISTINE MASH
CONTRACTING OFFICER
Email: doa.oppm.procurement@alaska.gov

COMPANY SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DATE

Questions submitted by potential offerors and answers from the State:

Question 1: We note the RFP includes a timeline with the Data Collection Report to be provided by February 23, 2024. This timing could be a challenge due to the timing of the survey being over the holidays. Also, the RFP indicates the survey will include over 400 job classifications, which is substantially more than included in the typical survey (which generally has under 200). Would the State consider different timing in anticipation of challenges in receiving adequate survey responses?

Answer 1: Yes, however, the State would want the offeror to present an alternative proposed timeline that highlights their plan for getting the end results/deliverables completed timely.

Question 2: On page 27 of the RFP, the design report is due by December 15, 2023, and the collection report is due by February 23, 2024. What is the client's expectation for the dates the survey would be conducted?

Answer 2: The State expects the offeror to propose their intended methodology and timeline for the survey administration and collection of data. The information gathered through the survey should be submitted as part of the Data Collection Report which is listed as being due by February 23, 2024. If the offeror has an alternative proposed timeline, they may present this to the State in a manner that highlights their plan for getting the end results/deliverables completed timely.

Question 3: We understand the client is interested in a custom survey for the market data research. Is the client open to a combination of a custom survey and utilizing published surveys? (For context, we understand the survey would include about 400 jobs and it is unlikely other employers will want or have sufficient time to complete a survey that includes more than 50 jobs.)

Answer 3: Yes, we are open to utilizing published surveys so long as the data is relevant and current. Any surveys used should have been published within the last year.

Question 4: Would procurement be willing to revise the RFP to include, "Allow the contract to be used by other governmental entities"? (For context, we have received feedback from other state procurement officers that including this language may allow other states or governmental entities to piggyback on the contract.)

Answer 4: No, this specific project is for the Division of Personnel and was not intended to be a master contract.

Question 5: Does the State currently subscribe to any compensation surveys that the selected consultant would incorporate into the analysis? If so, which surveys? For example, does the State currently subscribe to NCASG?

Answer 5: The state subscribes to NCASG, Milliman, and ERI. The selected consultant may choose to incorporate this data into their analysis, though the State expects additional data and information to be gathered and incorporated for a more comprehensive and thorough data set.

Question 6: Does the State have accurate and up to date job descriptions? Does the State wish for the consultant to conduct an employee questionnaire to gather job specific information?

Answer 6: As of the time of this publishing, the State has 1076 individual job class specifications each of which describes a grouping of work to include the Class Title, Class Definition, Examples of Duties, and Minimum Qualifications. 404 of these job classes were selected for our comparison pool. These are the descriptions of record that we would refer to when considering the work to be compared to other employers. If a questionnaire would be helpful in gathering information to determine whether the job classes are a match, then the State would like the offeror to describe what this would look like.

Question 7: Page 40, Section 5.04 of Evaluation Criteria indicates that points will be assessed based on whether the Offeror has submitted letters of reference. Page 35, Section 4.04 Experience and Qualifications (Submittal Form B) states that Offerors must provide reference names and phone numbers.

- a. Does the State prefer to receive letters of recommendation, or does the State prefer to receive contact information alone?
- b. If the State prefers to receive letters of recommendation, please advise if those letters count towards the 5-page maximum length of Submittal Form B.

Answer 7:

- a. The State requires offeror to submit letters of references.
- b. Resumes and letter of references are not included in the page limit count.

Question 8: Is it the State's expectation that the Offeror conduct a custom survey of identified peers? If yes, would the State consider utilizing existing salary sources in lieu of the custom survey process in order to ensure statistically reliable and complete information on the selected jobs?

Answer 8: Yes, we are open to utilizing published surveys so long as the data is relevant and current. Any surveys used should have been published at least within the last year. A custom survey should still be developed and utilized, but existing data may be used to supplement the information gathered through the custom survey.

Question 9: If the State wishes to have a custom survey conducted, has the State completed a similar process in the past? If yes, how successful was the State in garnering participation from the peer groups identified?

Answer 9: The State conducted a Salary Survey in 2009 during which 80 organizations were contacted and 65 participated in providing salary and benefits information. The documents and results related to this study can be found here: <https://doa.alaska.gov/dop/salaryStudy/survey/>

Question 10: What is the State's expectation regarding those jobs not included in the list of benchmark job classes?

Answer 10: The offeror does not need to make recommendations or conduct analysis on the job classes not included in the list of benchmark job classes.

Question 11: Does the State currently utilize a Point Factor System? If yes, does the State wish to continue to utilize a point Factor System, or is the State interested in pursuing other options that may provide a more relevant system of determining internal equity?

Answer 11: The State does not utilize a Point Factor System, but rather utilizes whole Job Classification. The State is open to feedback on other options that may provide a more relevant system of determining internal equity, if relevant.

Question 12: Does the State expect that the analysis and resulting recommendations will include benefits and total rewards, or does the State expect results will be based on base pay and total compensation only?

Answer 12: The primary focus of this survey is to assess base pay and compensation; however, the State expects at least a basic assessment of how our benefits offered (health insurance, paid holidays, and leave) compared to other employers.

Question 13: Has this has been done in the past, if so, do you have survey templates etc, that you would like us to use?

Answer 13: Please see Question 9.

Question 14: Precisely what compensation data points do you want collected – salary, bonuses, and some elements of benefits? What type of benefit questions, plan types, design, value?

Answer 14: We would like salary data collected for base salary and 5-year salary. For benefits, a basic assessment of how our benefits offered (health insurance, paid holidays, and leave) compared to other employers.

Question 15: Are you also asking companies to provide information employee seniority, knowledge and skills?

Answer 15: No.

Question 16: Do you have a list of targeted participants?

- If so, do you have a point of contact at these organizations?
- How many organizations do you have on your target list?

Answer 16: No. The offeror should propose recommendations for targeted participants. The list of participants can be determined with the State project manager after the contract is awarded.

Question 17: It appears that the data analysis and interpretation report is not presented to the State – can you please say more about your expectation with this step?

Answer 17: The RFP states the following for Data Analysis and Interpretation:

- a. Compile and clean the collected survey data to ensure data accuracy and consistency.*
- b. Perform thorough statistical analysis to identify trends, patterns, and variations in compensation across job roles, experience levels, and departments.*
- c. Compare the survey data against industry benchmarks and public sector compensation trends, if available, to provide context.*

Data Analysis and Interpretation report must be submitted by April 5, 2024.

The State expects that the offeror will discuss the preliminary findings of the Data Analysis and Interpretation phase with the State's project manager and team. From there, the offeror will work on compiling the Preliminary Report.

Please see the answer to Question 1 for more information about timelines.

Question 18: There is no mention of a participant report - would this be offered as a thank you for participating.

Answer 18: The State is not currently planning to share a participant report, but this may be discussed during the initial phases of the project once the contract is awarded.

Question 19: Who assisted the State with the preparation of the RFP?

Answer 19: The RFP was prepared by the Classification Manager, Assistant Classification Manager, and Procurement. It was also reviewed by designated contacts from the Governor's Office.

Question 20: The way I read the proposal is that you want a survey and where we actually would send a questionnaire out to individual organizations and collect data. But the term study was used, which can definitely be used interchangeably. But I just want to make sure that like to me a study, we could use published data also. So I want to be sure I understand that this is a survey that you wanted or did you want both or.

Answer 20: Please see Question 8.

Question 21: I noticed in the proposal it mentioned that the State has an existing comparator pool and I was wondering how many organizations that entails?

Answer 21: The comparison pool is listed in the RFP and is comprised of 404 different job classes out of our almost 1100 job classes that we have covering the classified and partially exempt services. We selected 404 benchmarks and that's what makes up our comparison pool. We do not have a comparator pool of other employers that we are looking to compare to. We expect the offeror to propose a plan and potential participants as part of their proposal.

Question 22: I noticed in the data collection under the Survey Design step Part B, It mentions that the contractor should employ multiple data collection methods including surveys and interviews. I wonder if you could clarify what was meant by interviews.

Answer 22: We include interviews as an optional data collection method. If you are surveying an employer and you would like to gather additional information to determine whether their job classes are comparable to the ones in our comparison pool, you may wish to conduct an interview with these participants. We don't anticipate in depth employee interviews for all of the participants or their data sets. Interviews are simply another mechanism that you might employ in order to just gather more information and ensure that the data you're collecting is comprehensive and is a good match to what we're looking for.

Question 23: I thought it was a really great question and that really helped understand how you were using the comparator pool. But in terms of your external comparison, there's been mention of various levels of state, local government, and private industry. Do you have anything like, do you have an either a definition specifically, especially around the private industry

area or a list of organizations that you've already thought through and or a number of those organizations?

Answer 23: We don't have a set participant list for this project. We anticipate that the offeror presents to us their recommendations for employers that would be surveyed. The State is open to having conversations and fine tuning a participant list as part of the onboarding process after the contract is awarded.

Question 24: You mentioned that the last comprehensive study the State undertook was back in 2009. Is it possible to get the listing of organizations that the state compared against during that study as a starting point to kind of get an idea regards to who? You compared against in the past. Do you mean as part of whoever is selected for this project or prior to that as part of the proposal process, prior to that, as part of the proposal process to kind of get an understanding of what you have done in the past?

Answer 24: It is publicly published on our State of Alaska website. The documents and results related to this study can be found here: <https://doa.alaska.gov/dop/salaryStudy/survey/>

Question 25: With regard to the comment on recommendations that are expected as part of the final report, one of the items listed in the RFP talks about salary and benefit change recommendations. Often times those have fiscal implications and we're asked to model scenarios for clients to ensure there's complete understanding about those recommendations. Is that is that anticipated as part of the timing requirements, the end of June requirements as part of the contractors responsibility?

Answer 25: The primary focus of this project is salary. For benefits, we are simply asking for a basic assessment of how our benefits offered (health insurance, paid holidays, and leave) compared to other employers. We are not asking for model scenarios in regard to benefits as a part of this project.

Question 26: If the cost implications would be modeling would that means a very detailed deep dive into the benefits. That are offered the cost of the benefits, the value of the benefits, the design of the benefits, etc. Is that your expectation that we would get into that level or is it your expectation?

Answer 26: Please see the answer to Question 26.

Question 27: In the RFP document you talk about the overall timeline of the engagements and then the final results and work are backed up from that by a few months. So just wondering what your actual timeline is for the work overall.

Answer 27: In the proposal we outlined a tentative timeline for what we anticipate or what we are asking for in terms of the deliverables in the specific phases of this project. We are however open to the offerors proposals on potentially alternative timelines if there is something that they would like to tweak in terms of the length of different phases. We would like to see that as part of your proposal. The final report and recommendation do need to be submitted prior to or on June 30th, 2024, that date is not negotiable.

Question 28: In talking with some other states that over the past year or so that have done similar studies, there have been interesting cases and challenges that have maybe come out from some of

those states that they weren't foreseeing. What are some of your biggest concerns within the cultural context of the state of Alaska that maybe keeps you up at night?

Answer 28: The salary study is only phase one of this project. I think the biggest concern and challenge that we will see is not in this study itself but in the implementation. The State is undergoing this project so that we can provide a comprehensive report and recommendation about compensation to our legislators and our governor's office and other executives so that they can make informed decisions about what changes to implement.

Question 29: I think this is a question that has some nuance to it, so that's why I'm picking it out of the questions I sent. It appears that the data analysis and interpretation report as it was written, if I understood it correctly in the RFP is not actually presented to the state it looks like it's in. It's like a just a step thing that you all want to make sure we get done. And then we go into the next step of the preliminary report. I want to make sure I'm understanding that correctly because it impacts the timing. So, like if we're doing a data analysis interpretation report by April 5th and then more than a month later a preliminary report and if. We are doing a survey. Somebody could send in data, or we could be calling companies still to get clarification about data. So, data could change between those two dates. And so that's why it's important to understand sort of what your expectation around that February 23rd date is.

Answer 29: Please see the answers to Questions 1 and 18.

Question 30: How was the funding for this project determined? And if we think about that mid-May deadline for a preliminary report, can you talk a little bit about the expectations in terms of socializing that information across various stakeholders? And any time implications for that to occur if the June 30th deadline is non-negotiable?

Answer 30: This is a very public facing project. It is well known that this project is underway and that means that we will want to keep our stakeholders aware of the progress that we are making in terms of sharing the actual preliminary report. However, we would not release a copy of the preliminary report to the general public. The preliminary report would be shared with a small group of high-level executives for initial review.

Question 31: Someone had asked whether we currently subscribed to any other compensation surveys like NCASG.

Answer 31: Please see the answer to Question 5.

Changes to the RFP:

Change 1: RFP page 35, Sec 4.04 Experience and Qualifications (Submittal Form B)

REMOVE sentence: "Offerors must also provide reference names and phone numbers for similar projects the offeror's firm has completed."

Replace 1: Offerors must also provide letter of reference for similar projects the offeror's firm has completed. Resumes and letter of references are not included in the page limit count.
