



Subject: Course of Conduct and Action

Dear Selection Committee Members:

Please review and adhere to this course of conduct and action for members of a Selection Committee.

Selection Committee Members shall have no contact with any employee of a company or person representing a company submitting a proposal to the County. This includes casual discussions in social settings, requests for information, or offers to clarify or expand upon the Request for Proposals (RFP). Any questions from a proposed vendor or communications from a proposed vendor shall be directed to the Contracts and Procurement.

If Committee Members have on-going projects which involve vendors that could be submitting proposal, conversations on those projects shall be carefully limited to avoid discussion of an RFP.

Committee Members may receive no gratuities from proposers, their officers or employees, or individuals representing them. Please refer County Ordinance 2.07 "County Ethics Code" and to State Law 63G-6a-2301 "Unlawful Conduct and Penalties".

Committee Members are charged with carefully evaluating each proposal. Members must have a firm understanding of the RFP criteria pursuant to which proposals are to be evaluated. Proposals must be ranked consistent with those criteria.

Finally, Committee Members shall neither discuss nor disclose to the public or to County employees the identity of other Committee Members, information submitted in a proposal, discussions or recommendations issued by the Selection Committee.

If there are any questions with respect to any component of this procurement process, please contact the Director of Contracts and Procurement.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Version 2017

SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBER HANDBOOK

I. INTRODUCTION

This Handbook is written to assist you, as a member of a proposal Selection Committee, in understanding the policies, principles, evaluation procedures, criteria and scoring mechanisms for proposals received in response to a Request for Proposals (RFP).

II. EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Principle #1

Reasonable steps must be taken to eliminate biases and allow for variations in the proposers responding style to ensure a fair and equitable evaluation.

During the evaluation, it is important to treat all proposers fairly and equally, and to evaluate their proposals in accordance with the process described in the RFP. Care must be taken throughout the process not to take any actions or make decisions that could be construed as providing an unfair advantage to any proposers.

Committee Members are to review and evaluate each proposal on behalf and in the best interest of the County. Each Committee Member shall use the same evaluation measures or standards on all eligible proposals. The same level of effort should be extended to the evaluation of all proposals received.

Principle #2

The Selection Committee make-up and their responsibilities.

A Selection Committee is made up of County Agency members and any other qualified community representatives as deemed appropriate for the selection of the specific RFP. The Selection Committee should consist of five to seven Members. There should be a mix of Members, preferably not all from one Agency, if possible. Contracts and Procurement will serve as the Chair of the Committee. The Chair will be a non-scoring Member.

Each Committee Member should be present for the entire evaluation period: involved in reviewing and scoring all proposals, attend the Committee Meeting, and attend all interviews of the proposers. Attendance is critical to the quality of the evaluation process.

A Conflict of Interest disclosure form will be required from each Committee Member disclosing all restricted and unrestricted conflicts that might exist. If the disclosed personal or financial interest of any Committee Member presents a conflict that could be prejudicial to the selection process if that Member participates, the Purchasing Agent or Selection Committee may dismiss that Member from the Committee. Please refer to Policy 7030, Section 5.0

Principle #3

Only information provided with a proposal can be used to evaluate that proposal.

If a Proposer provides an unclear response, the Chair of the Selection Committee may contact the Proposer to restate a portion of the proposal for clarification. See Policy 7030 6.2.

Committee Members cannot seek major new pieces of information, which would *materially improve* the proposal, or change the scope of the proposal. For example, suppose a Proposer provides a project schedule with only 4 milestones. It is not appropriate to contact the Proposer and indicate that the plan was inadequate and request a new, more detailed plan, with at least 20 milestones.

Best and Final Offer (BAFO) amending the RFP may be requested for all Proposers that submitted or from the short-listed Proposers that are invited for discussions. For example, if the Selection Committee Members feel that all proposals lacked detail on the project schedule, a BAFO could request a project schedule be submitted with each item under “tasks to be completed” addressed on the timeline.

Principle #4

Committee Members shall perform each evaluation step independent of the others and each Committee Member must be impartial in evaluating the proposals.

Each Committee Member should make up his or her own mind as to the proper evaluation score, and may wait until the committee has discussed the proposals before finalizing his or her scores

As the evaluation process is considered confidential, it is imperative that the Committee Members be aware of the need for confidentiality. Members are expected to:

- a. not discuss the proposals or disclose their contents to anyone other than their fellow Committee Members
- b. only discuss the proposals with other Committee Members during the Committee Meeting
- c. keep all notes, discussions, and point ratings confidential and not disclose their substance or details to others
- d. evaluate the proposals strictly in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in the RFP
- e. not have conversations with Proposers concerning the RFP or selection process

III. PROPOSED SCORING SYSTEM

The Committee Members will individually evaluate and numerically score the program

proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria described in the RFP. Each Member will be provided with score sheets. Prior to the Committee Meeting, each Member will review the proposals and score accordingly. Contracts and Procurement will score the pricing proposal. The proposal review scores will be finalized at Committee Meeting after discussion among the Members. **Committee Members may write questions and highlight items that they wish to bring up at the Committee meeting on their proposal copies.**

Upon completing the evaluation of the submitted proposals, a point total will be calculated for each. The highest rated proposals may be scheduled for interviews. At the end of the interview phase, final score sheets will be completed to indicate the final ranking of the Proposers.

Committee Members individually score the proposals following the guidelines below. The Committee Chair then transfers the scores to a master ranking sheet to determine who is 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. ranked.

The following point system is utilized:

Excellent (5): If the proposal offer exceeds expectations, with an excellent probability of success in achieving all requirements of the RFP, and is very detailed in providing innovative ideas, new concepts or optional features applicable to the project; a score of "5" is given.

Good (4): If the proposal offers a very good probability of success, achieves all requirements of the RFP in a reasonable fashion and provides some innovative ideas, new concepts or optional features applicable to the project; a score of "4" is given.

Acceptable (3): If the proposal offers a reasonable probability of success, but some of the requirements may not be met and does not include innovative ideas, new concepts or optional features applicable to the project; a score of "3" is given.

Poor (1-2): If the proposal falls short of expectations and has a low probability of success; a score of "1-2" is given.

Unacceptable: If the approach completely fails the requirements; a score of "0" is given.

IV. REFERENCES

References are usually checked after the initial scoring is completed and an interview list has been determined. Questions asked should relate directly to the evaluation criteria and the same questions should be asked of all contacts.

V. CONFIDENTIALITY OF PROPOSALS

All proposals and their contents are considered a confidential protected record and shall not be discussed with anyone outside the Selection Committee, i.e.,

suppliers/proposers, staff members, media, etc. The proposals and score sheets become a public record when there is an agreement signed by both parties.

Any requests received by Committee Member or the end-using Agency to view proposals, score sheets, or the agreement shall be directed to Contracts and Procurement. Contracts and Procurement will require an official "records request" from the requestor

VI. STEPS IN THE PROCESS

Prior to Issuance of Request for Proposal

- Agency prepares an RFP development worksheet concerning the project.
- Agency and Contracts and Procurement conduct a pre-development meeting.
- Preparation of the Request for Proposals by Contracts & Procurement with Agency review.
- Approval of the RFP is needed from the Department Director or Elected Official before it is released to the public.

Issuance of the Request for Proposals by Contracts and Procurement

- Release of RFP in the Online Solicitation System.
- Notification e-mail to Division Director, Department Director, Attorney, Council, and Mayor.
- Notify Selection Committee Members of course of conduct and meeting dates.

Receipt of the Proposals

- Proposals received by Contracts & Procurement.
- Distribution of proposal packets to Selection Committee Members.

Evaluation/Selection Process

- Committee Members shall carefully read each proposal and fill out a score sheet.
- Committee s Meeting to discuss proposals, resolve differences and to ensure all Members share the same understanding of each proposal to come to an award recommendation.
- Interviews, demonstrations and on-site visits with top ranked Proposers selected by the Committee Members (if needed).
- Request for best and final offer (if needed).
- References checked (if needed).
- Final evaluation and ranking by Committee Members.

Award Phase

- Recommendation to enter into a contract submitted to the Mayor's Office.
- Preparation of agreement by the District Attorney's office.
- Contract negotiation between county and proposer (if needed).
- Signing of contract by Proposer.
- Signing of contract by Mayor or Designee.