

**State of Florida
Department of Children and Families**



**ITN# - 20181801MCARE
MEDICARE BILLING, REPORTING, CONSULTING, AND AUDITING SERVICES**

Evaluation Manual

Evaluator Name: _____

Vendor Name: _____

Date of Reply Evaluation: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____

1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 Each evaluator will evaluate the programmatic reply for all vendor replies that pass the mandatory criteria. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. Fractional values will not be accepted. If an evaluator score sheet(s) is missing scores, it will be returned for completion. Scoring must reflect the evaluator's independent evaluation of the reply to each evaluation criterion.
- 1.2 Each evaluator shall assign a score for each evaluation criterion based upon his/her assessment of the reply. The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores:

IF, in your judgment the reply demonstrates and/or describes...	Category	...assign points within ...
...extensive competency, proven capabilities, an outstanding approach to the subject area, innovative, practical and effective solutions, a clear and complete understanding of inter-relationships, full responsiveness, a clear and comprehensive understanding of the requirements and planning for the unforeseen.	Superior	81-100% of the maximum points for the area.
...clear competency, consistent capability, a reasoned approach to the subject area, feasible solutions, a generally clear and complete description of inter-relationships, extensive but incomplete responsiveness and a sound understanding of the requirements.	Good	61-80% of the maximum points for the area.
...fundamental competency, adequate capability, a basic approach to the subject area, apparently feasible but somewhat unclear solutions, a weak description of inter-relationships in some areas, partial responsiveness, a fair understanding of the requirements and a lack of staff experience and skills in some areas.	Adequate	41-60% of the maximum points for the area.
...little competency, minimal capability, an inadequate approach to the subject area, infeasible and/or ineffective solutions, somewhat unclear, incomplete and /or non-responsive, a lack of understanding of the requirements and a lack of demonstrated experience and skills.	Poor	21-40 %of the maximum points for the area.
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant of complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0-20% of the maximum points for the area.

- 1.3 When completing score sheets evaluators should record references to the sections of the Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) and the written reply materials which most directly pertain to the criterion and upon which their scores were based. More than one section may be recorded. Evaluators should not attempt an exhaustive documentation of every bit of information considered but only key information. In general, the reference statements should be brief. If the reply does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate "not addressed" and score it accordingly.
- 1.4 Each evaluator has been provided a copy of the ITN, including its appendices, any ITN amendments, and vendor written inquiries and the written responses provided by the Department. Each evaluator will also be

Department of Children and Families
**MEDICARE BILLING, REPORTING, CONSULTING, AND AUDITING
SERVICES**

- provided with a copy of each programmatic reply which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation and the evaluation manual.
- 1.5 Replies shall be independently scored by each member of the evaluation team. No collaboration is permitted during the scoring process. The same scoring principles must be applied to every reply received, independent of other evaluators. Evaluators should work carefully to be as thorough as possible in order to ensure a fair and open competitive procurement. No attempt by Department personnel or others, including other evaluators, to influence an evaluator's scoring shall be tolerated.
 - 1.6 If any attempt is made to influence an evaluator, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Procurement Manager. If such an attempt is made by the Procurement Manager, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Inspector General.
 - 1.7 The Procurement Manager will conduct reference checks via telephone interviews.
 - 1.8 Only the rating sheets provided should be used. No additional notes or marks should appear elsewhere in the evaluation manual.
 - 1.9 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and replies only from the Procurement Manager/Procurement Advisors.
 - 1.10 Questions related to the solicitation and the evaluations of the reply should be directed only to:
Ricky Goodman, Procurement Manager
Florida Department of Children and Families
Substance Abuse and Mental Health
7487 S SR 121 Building 16 Macclenny, FL 32063
 - 1.11 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each programmatic reply, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Manager for compilation. The Procurement Manager will average the total programmatic point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section.
 - 1.12 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the replies, the Procurement Manager will hold a meeting to validate evaluator scoring. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that their individual evaluation scores were captured correctly when preparing the total programmatic scores.

2 QUALITATIVE CRITERIA

Evaluators shall assign scores to each of the replies received by the Department based on the following criteria:

- Vendor's articulation of their project approach and solution, and the ability of the approach and solution to meet the Department's needs, the requirements of this ITN and Appendix I, Attachment I
- The innovation of the approach and solution
- Vendor references and track record implementing similar solutions to the one specified in this ITN
- Experience and skills of proposed staff relative to the proposed approach and solution

3 PROGRAMMATIC REPLY POINT VALUES

The maximum score for the Programmatic Reply is 100 points.

Programmatic Criteria	Maximum Points	Percent of Total (100 Points)
1. Vendor's articulation of their approach and solution, and the ability of the approach and solution to meet the Department's needs, the requirements of this ITN 4.2.4 TAB 3: Services approach and solution		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of Statement of Need • Description of Respondent's Programmatic Capability and Approach 	40	40%
Section 1 Subtotal	40	40%
2. Vendor References and track record implementing similar solutions to the one specified in this ITN 4.2.5 Tab 4: Company Qualifications and Experience		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate Organization and Structure • Description of the Respondent's and Subcontractors (if any) Organizational Qualifications & Relevant Experience 	40	40%
Section 2 Subtotal	40	40%
3. Vendor's financial management approach and proposed budget for this ITN 4.3.3 TAB B: Budget		
Description of Line item budget	20	20%
Section 3 Subtotal	20	20%
Total	100	100%

Evaluation Criteria 1

Criteria:
4.2.4 TAB 3: Services Approach and Solution

Notes/Rationale:

Score (0-40): _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.4 TAB 3: Services Approach and Solution 	40					

Evaluation Criteria 2

Criteria:
4.2.5 Tab 4: Company qualifications and experiences

Notes/Rationale:

Score (0-40): _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.5 Tab 4: Company qualifications and experiences 	40					

Evaluation Criteria 3

Criteria: 4.3.3 TAB B: Budget						
Notes/Rationale:						
Score (0-20): _____			Evaluator Initials: _____			
Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• 4.3.3 TAB B: Budget	20					