



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

Rick Scott
Governor

Mike Carroll
Secretary

DATE: March 23, 2018
TO: Prospective Vendors of RFP# 020118KSET1
FROM: Molly Conrad, Procurement Manager
SUBJECT: Posting the Evaluation Manual to the Vendor Bid System (VBS)

On February 26, 2018, the Department posted RFP #020118KSET1, Employment Services for Refugees and Entrants in Pinellas County, to the VBS. The Department is publishing this addendum to add the **Evaluation Manual (APPENDIX XIII)** to the Table of Contents, add references to the **Evaluation Manual** in **Sections 5.1** and **5.3.1.**, and add the **Evaluation Manual (APPENDIX XIII)** to the ITN. Additions are marked in **RED** below.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Introduction to the Procurement	4
1.2 Statement of Purpose	5
1.3 Term of the Agreement	5
1.4 Contact Person and Procurement Manager	5
1.5 Definitions	6
1.6 Supporting Documentation	6
1.7 Small, Minority, and Florida Certified Veterans Business Participation	7
SECTION 2. RFP PROCESS	8
2.1 General Overview of the Process	8
2.2 Official Notices and Public Records	8
2.3 Protests and Disputes	8
2.4 Limitations on Contacting Department Personnel and Others	8
2.5 Schedule of Events and Deadlines	9
2.6 Solicitation Conference Call	10
2.7 Written Inquiries	10
2.8 Notice of Intent to Submit a Proposal	11

1317 Winewood Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0700

2.9	Receipt of Proposals	11
2.10	Form PUR 1001	12
2.11	Department’s Reserved Rights	12
SECTION 3. SPECIFICATIONS		13
3.1	Mandatory Requirements	13
3.2	Minimum Programmatic Specifications	13
3.3	Minimum Financial Specifications	38
3.4	Vendor Registration in MyFloridaMarketPlace	38
3.5	Composition of the Contract.....	38
3.6	Order of Precedence	39
SECTION 4. INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESPONDING TO THE RFP		40
4.1	How to Submit a Proposal	40
4.2	Content of the Programmatic Proposal	41
4.3	Content of the Financial Proposal	53
4.4	Public Records and Trade Secrets	56
4.5	Department not Obligated to Defend Vendor Claims	57
SECTION 5. THE SELECTION METHODOLOGY		58
5.1	Selection Criteria	58
5.2	Application of Mandatory Requirements	58
5.3	Evaluation Phase Methodology	58
5.4	Final Selection and Notice of Intent to Award Contract	60
APPENDIX I: NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL.....		61
APPENDIX II: CERTIFICATE OF SIGNATURE AUTHORITY		62
APPENDIX III: MANDATORY CERTIFICATIONS		63
APPENDIX IV: QUESTION SUBMITTAL FORM.....		69
APPENDIX V: MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST		70
APPENDIX VI: SUBCONTRACTOR LIST.....		72
APPENDIX VII: BUDGET SUMMARY AND DETAIL INSTRUCTIONS		73
APPENDIX VIII: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY		75
APPENDIX IX: REPLIED COST ALLOCATION PLAN		76
APPENDIX X: FIXED PRICE BUDGET WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS		77
APPENDIX XI: FIXED PRICE BUDGET WORKSHEET		78

APPENDIX XII: Standard Integrated Contract Part 1 and Part 2

NOTE: In addition to the Appendices included in this document, APPENDIX XII, the Department's Standard Integrated Contract Part 1 and Part 2, will be included with the solicitation and uploaded to the Vendor Bid System (VBS) together with the RFP and all other related documents.

APPENDIX XIII: EVALUATION MANUAL79

5.1 Criteria

The Evaluation Manual (APPENDIX XIII) and the following shall apply for this RFP (in the event of a conflict between the Evaluation Manual and the RFP for this purpose, the Evaluation Manual shall control):

Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services through the initial term and any renewal period and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information.

The Department may consider any information or evidence which comes to its attention and which reflects upon a Vendor's capability to fully perform the contract requirements and/or the Vendor's demonstration of the level of integrity and reliability which the Department determines to be required to assure performance of the contract.

5.3.1 Scoring

The Department's Evaluators will independently evaluate each Programmatic Proposal in accordance with the Evaluation Manual (APPENDIX XIII) and the following criteria:

Criteria	Relative Value	Possible Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.	25%	250
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the	40%	400

Criteria	Relative Value	Possible Points
ones specified in this RFP.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services. 	15%	150
TOTAL	80%	800

The Department's Financial Evaluator and Procurement Manager will independently evaluate each Financial Proposal in accordance with the **Evaluation Manual (APPENDIX XIII)** and the following criteria:

Criteria	Relative Value	Possible Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. 	20%	200
TOTAL	20%	200

THIS SPACE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

APPENDIX XIII

State of Florida
Department of Children and Families



RFP# - 020118KSET1
Employment Services for Refugees and Entrants in
Pinellas County

EVALUATION MANUAL

Evaluator Name: _____

Vendor Name: _____

Date of Proposal Evaluation: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____

1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1.1 Each evaluator will evaluate the programmatic proposal for all Vendor proposals that pass the mandatory criteria. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. Fractional values will not be accepted. If an evaluator score sheet is missing scores, it will be returned for completion. Scoring must reflect the evaluator's independent evaluation of the proposal to each evaluation criterion.

1.2 Each evaluator shall assign a score for each evaluation criterion based upon his/her assessment of the proposal. The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores:

IF, in your judgment the proposal 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 or 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 Request for Proposals (RFP) and the written proposal 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 refer to key information. In general, the reference statements should be brief. If the proposal 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 RFP, including its appendices, any RFP amendments, and Vendor written inquiries and the written responses provided by the Department. Each evaluator will also be

provided with a copy of each programmatic proposal, which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation and the evaluation manual.

- 1.5 Proposals 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 proposal 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 Only the rating sheets provided should be used. No additional notes or marks should appear elsewhere in the evaluation manual.
- 1.8 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and proposals only from the Procurement Manager.
- 1.9 Questions related to the solicitation and the evaluations of the proposals should be directed only to:
Molly Conrad, Procurement Manager
Florida Department of Children and Families, Refugee Services Program
1317 Winewood Blvd.
Building 6, Room 241
Tallahassee, FL 32399
E-Mail Address: Molly.Conrad@myflfamilies.com
- 1.10 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each programmatic proposal, 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.
- 1.11 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the proposals, the Procurement Manager will hold a meeting to validate evaluator scoring. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that each individual's evaluation scores were captured correctly when preparing the total programmatic scores.

2 SELECTION CRITERIA

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

- The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services through the initial term and any renewal period and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.
- The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.
- The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.

- *Financial Proposal:* The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: *This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator will not evaluate or score the Financial Proposal.*)

3 PROGRAMMATIC PROPOSAL POINT VALUES AND FINANCIAL PROPOSAL POINTS VALUES

The maximum score for the Programmatic Proposal is 800 points.

The maximum score for the Financial Proposal is 200 points

Programmatic Criteria	Maximum Points	Percent of Total (1000 Points)
1. The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services through the initial term and any renewal period and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.		
Executive Overview	50	5%
Services Approach and Solution	200	20%
Section 1 Subtotal	250	25%
2. The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.		
Experience and track record	150	15%
Organizational Structure (stability, support, oversight, etc.)	50	5%
Capability to Deliver Services (ability to achieve service unit goals, exceed performance measures, accommodate client needs, etc.)	200	20%
Section 2 Subtotal	400	40%
3. The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.		
Staff and Leadership Team	100	10%
Resources	50	5%
Section 3 Subtotal	150	15%

Department of Children and Families
Employment Services for Refugees and Entrants in
Pinellas County

Financial Proposal Criteria	Maximum Points	Percent of Total (1000 Points)
4. Financial Proposal: The Vendor’s financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator will <u>not</u> evaluate or score the Financial Proposal.)		
Financial Stability / Financial Management	30	3%
Budget	140	14%
Cost Comparison	30	3%
Section 4 Subtotal	200	20%
Total	1000	100%

Evaluation Criteria 1 – Sub Criteria 1

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services through the initial term and any renewal period and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Executive Overview</p>
<p><i>RFP Programmatic Proposal Instructions:</i> The Vendor shall provide a brief executive overview demonstrating an understanding of the RFP purpose stated in Section 1.2, and the needs specified in this RFP. The Vendor shall also demonstrate a strong understanding of the overall goals of the program. The Executive Overview should include a brief description of the Vendor's organization, leadership credentials, approach for Scope of Work services, management of Performance Specifications, and completing Deliverables as defined in this RFP.</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> Tab 3: EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vendor demonstrates a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) understanding of the population. • The Vendor demonstrates a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) understanding of the need/purpose of employment services in the service area. • The Vendor demonstrates a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) understanding of the overall goals of the program. • The Vendor's overall approach to the method of service delivery is (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient).

Department of Children and Families
Employment Services for Refugees and Entrants in
Pinellas County

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services through the initial term and any renewal period and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.</p>						
<p>Sub criteria: Executive Overview</p>						
<p><i>Notes/Rationale:</i></p>						
<p><i>Score (0-50):</i> _____</p>			<p><i>Evaluator Initials:</i> _____</p>			
Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Executive Overview	50					

Evaluation Criteria 1 – Sub Criteria 2

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services through the initial term and any renewal period and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Services Approach and Solution</p>
<p><i>RFP Programmatic Proposal Instructions:</i> The Vendor shall describe its approach to performing the Service Component Tasks described in Sections 3.2.9 and the Performance Measures and Vendor Unique Activities found in Sections 3.2.22 – 3.2.25 and how it will meet all of the Department's detailed requirements. Specifically, the Vendor must explain in detail the methods it will use to develop, implement, and manage an employment service system that includes all of the services outlined in this RFP. If the Vendor will be utilizing subcontractors to deliver certain services, the Vendor must describe in detail how these subcontracted Vendors will also be capable of meeting the Department's detailed requirements. The Vendor must outline how various services and subcontracts will be managed throughout Pinellas County and how subcontractors will be held accountable if performance standards are not met.</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> TAB 4: SERVICES APPROACH AND SOLUTION</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vendor's plan for providing employment services is (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient). The Vendor demonstrates how services will be provided in a reasonable, cost-effective, and efficient manner. • The Vendor's proposed method for developing effective, realistic, and client-centered Family Self-Sufficiency and Employability Plans is (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient). • The Vendor's method of analyzing the local job market and developing jobs which take into account and fit the needs of the target population, including effective strategies and experience in developing job opportunities that are not advertised positions, are (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient). • The Vendor's plan for delivering child care services is (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient). • The Vendor describes a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) plan for conducting orientation, client eligibility determination, intakes, assessments, and case management/case coordination. • The Vendor is familiar with Refugee Cash Assistance and Welfare Transition job search program requirements and demonstrates the (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) ability to work in conjunction with other entities to provide a smooth employment experience for clients. • The Vendor describes how it will provide (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) supportive services. The Vendor describes existing and planned links with local organizations

Criteria:

The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services through the initial term and any renewal period and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.

Sub criteria:

Services Approach and Solution

that will benefit refugees. The Vendor explains how it will document and track referrals made to partner organizations.

- The Vendor's description and justification of any additional tasks that it proposes is (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) (i.e. translation services, transportation assistance, Adult Education, etc.).
- The Vendor proposes engaging and effective orientation and pre-job placement work adjustment counseling services that are (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) which will develop clients' knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- The proposal includes (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) supporting documentation about the Vendor's relationship for working effectively with the Regional Workforce Board with Welfare Transition clients. An MOU is preferable. A letter of support may garner points depending on its quality.
- The Vendor proposes a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) broad base of job placement activities to place clients into jobs which are a good match for their skills, life situation, and career goals, as well as supports them through the application and interview process.
- The Vendor proposes (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) Career Laddering services which will adequately screen and provide an easy path for clients to get into higher-paying positions or into their chosen professions.
- The Vendor proposes (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) short-term training services which align with the current job market and will be a good resource for unskilled refugees and entrants to receive useful and focused job skills for entering employment quickly after training.
- The Vendor proposes (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) Self Employment Assistance, On-the-Job Training, or other additional services which will enhance clients' likelihood to gain self-sufficiency and effective integration.
- The Vendor proposes a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) case management component which will include follow-up contact to determine economic status and job retention.

Criteria: The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services through the initial term and any renewal period and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this RFP and provide additional value.						
Sub criteria: Services Approach and Solution						
<i>Notes/Rationale:</i>						
<i>Score (0-200):</i> _____			<i>Evaluator Initials:</i> _____			
	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services Approach and Solution 	200					

Evaluation Criteria 2 – Sub Criteria 1

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Experience and Track Record</p>
<p><i>RFP Programmatic Proposal Instructions:</i> The Vendor must describe any experience in providing similar services as requested in this RFP. The experience should include work done by the individuals who will be assigned to the work described in this RFP, as well as the overall experience of the organization. State whether the Vendor was the prime contractor or a subcontractor and whether it worked in cooperation with a subcontractor. Where applicable, clearly note the Vendor's related experience which includes individuals who will be assigned and their role on the past project. Provide a detailed description of any work to be subcontracted, including information describing the qualifications and relevant experience of any proposed subcontractors.</p> <p>Describe the Vendor's history working with refugees and entrants. Describe the Vendor's history providing employment services or other refugee-related services. Describe any attributes that make the Vendor capable of providing the proposed services to the target population. Describe the Vendor's history working with multicultural, multilingual client populations. Include information about caseload, breadth of service in the county identified or in a geographical area of comparable size, and success rate in achieving positive outcomes for clients.</p> <p>Provide a summary of past audits, reviews, and monitoring results, as well as the Vendor's response to addressing any issues revealed by them. If the Vendor has worked on a Department contract previously, present any performance reviews or feedback from the Department (positive or negative), focusing especially on the last two (2) years of that contract.</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> TAB 5: COMPANY QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the table found on page 81 of this Evaluation Manual and take into account the following guidelines when evaluating the next three (3) criterion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6 or more years of experience = Superior - 4 to 5 years of experience = Good - 2 to 3 years of experience = Adequate - 1 year of experience or less = Poor - 0 years of experience = Insufficient • (1) The Vendor has (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) experience providing services to refugees and entrants. • (2) The Vendor has (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) experience providing employment services. • (3) The Vendor has (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) experience working with multicultural, multilingual populations.

Criteria:

The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.

Sub criteria:

Experience and Track Record

- The Vendor has presented (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) evidence showing that it historically meets or exceeds performance expectations on a consistent basis.
- The Vendor has (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) experience achieving positive outcomes for its clients.
- The Vendor provides (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) evidence of proactive and timely management of any audits, reviews, and/or monitoring results. The Vendor's response to any findings was exceptional (prompt, thorough, and appropriate).
- The Vendor's monitoring results and performance reviews have been primarily (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) in nature.

Notes/Rationale:

Criteria:
The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.

Sub criteria:
Experience and Track Record

Score (0-150): _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Experience and Track Record	150					

Evaluation Criteria 2 – Sub Criteria 2

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Organizational Structure (stability, support, oversight, etc.)</p>
<p><i>RFP Programmatic Proposal Instructions:</i> The Vendor shall describe its organization and governance structure, depicting clear lines of authority including corporate affiliations; describe how the structure represents a lean, efficient and effective administrative model; and describe experience and achievements in developing a governance model designed to avoid conflicts of interest.</p> <p>The Vendor must ensure that it operates in accordance with 2 CFR, Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Grant Guidance). The Vendor shall describe how it will ensure compliance with these federal regulations.</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> TAB 3: EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW TAB 5: COMPANY QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE TAB 6: CORE TEAM QUALIFICATIONS</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vendor has an (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) administrative organizational structure to fulfill all of the responsibilities under this project, including Management Information Systems. The Vendor provides a detailed "organizational chart" that clearly delineates leadership roles and demonstrates the Vendor's (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) capability to effectively and efficiently deliver these services. • The Vendor has a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) administrative organizational structure to fulfill all the responsibilities under this contract, including program oversight and management of information systems. • The Vendor details all established and potential subcontracts and proposes a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) plan for identifying, recruiting, vetting, and retaining subcontractors that will be providing certain proposed services. • The Vendor's description of how it will ensure that it operates in accordance with 2 CFR, Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements of Federal Awards (Uniform Grant Guidelines). As evidence of compliance, the Vendor has submitted (1) Written Procurement Policies and Procedures; (2) Written Monitoring Policies and Procedures; (3) The Vendor's DUNS number; and (4) Suspension and Disbarment Information from the Federal Government's FAPIIS website is (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient).

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.</p>						
<p>Sub criteria: Organizational Structure (stability, support, oversight, etc.)</p>						
<p><i>Notes/Rationale:</i></p>						
<p><i>Score (0-50):</i> _____</p>			<p><i>Evaluator Initials:</i> _____</p>			
Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational Structure 	50					

Evaluation Criteria 2 – Sub Criteria 3

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Capability to Deliver Services (ability to achieve service unit goals, exceed performance measures, accommodate client needs, etc.)</p>
<p>RFP Programmatic Proposal Instructions: The service tasks described in Sections 3.2.9 and 4.2.5 shall be used to establish service units in any resulting contract, taking the Vendor's proposed members into consideration. Deliverables/service units will be further negotiated with the Vendor. The Vendor is encouraged to propose additional tasks and deliverables/service units.</p> <p>Also, the proposal must include a narrative describing how the number of service units was determined, the Vendor's past experience in achieving proposed service units, and the project management/monitoring activities that will be used to ensure the Vendor will deliver the proposed number of service units.</p> <p>Sample performance measures are indicated in Sections 3.2.22 and 3.2.24 of this RFP. The Vendor is encouraged to propose additional performance measures. All final performance measures will be negotiated with the Vendor. As stated in Section 3.2.22, the Department requests that the Vendor propose appropriate percentages for each of the performance measures listed in Sections 3.2.22 and 3.2.24. The Vendor must justify its reasoning for each of those proposed percentages.</p> <p>Explain in detail the Vendor's electronic management information systems capability that is necessary to complete all reporting requirements as outlined in Sections 3.2.20 - 3.2.21. Outline any additional technological capabilities that may be beneficial to program performance. Describe any specialized technology, computer training, or capabilities personnel have that will assist in helping meet program requirements.</p>
<p>RFP Related Text: TAB 4: SERVICES APPROACH AND SOLUTION TAB 5: COMPANY QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE</p>
<p>Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vendor proposes service units which are realistic and reasonable according to their program design, proposed staffing, and budgeted allotments. The Vendor demonstrates past experience in achieving similar results. • The Vendor provides a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) narrative describing how the number of service units was determined and how they are achievable. • Considering its past experience in achieving similar results, the Vendor has proposed performance measure percentages that are both reasonable and achievable. The Vendor's justification for each proposed percentage is (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient). • The proposal describes the Vendor's (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) process for tracking, meeting, and exceeding all of the sample deliverables and performance measures. The Vendor describes how it will analyze data to ensure credible documentation of service delivery.

Department of Children and Families
Employment Services for Refugees and Entrants in
Pinellas County

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this RFP.</p>						
<p>Sub criteria: Capability to Deliver Services (ability to achieve service unit goals, exceed performance measures, accommodate client needs, etc.)</p>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vendor's electronic management information systems are in line with Refugee Services requirements or propose a system to meet Refugee Services requirements. • Based on the Vendor's past experiences and current qualifications, the Vendor has established its (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) capacity to deliver all of the required services. 						
<p><i>Notes/Rationale:</i></p>						
<p><i>Score (0-200):</i> _____</p>				<p><i>Evaluator Initials:</i> _____</p>		
Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Capability to Deliver Services	200					

Evaluation Criteria 3 – Sub Criteria 1

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Staff and Leadership Team</p>
<p><i>RFP Programmatic Proposal Instructions:</i></p> <p>Core Team Qualifications (Evaluators, please refer to Section 4.2.7 for more details on these instructions)</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> TAB 5: COMPANY QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE TAB 6: CORE TEAM QUALIFICATIONS</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number and type of staff proposed for this project are suitable to provide appropriate services to the number of clients the Vendor intends to serve. • Staff time is targeted to provide a higher level of service to priority clients. • The Vendor describes an exceptional approach to the recruitment, training, supervision, and retention of qualified personnel. • The Vendor describes any special qualifications/certifications necessary for staff. • The Vendor's proposed onsite staff members have the relevant linguistic capability and cultural competency in relation to the population to be served. • The Vendor's description of activities that each staff member will be performing on a regular basis is (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient). Activities conducted by staff are both reasonable and necessary. • The Vendor describes a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) management team that is qualified (strong, organized, capable, responsible, goal-driven) to lead their organization in meeting the needs of the RFP. • The Vendor has demonstrated a reasonably low employee turnover rate over the last three (3) years. • The Vendor's service site(s) are convenient and easily accessible by clients, possibly including collocating services with other service providers.

Criteria: The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.						
Sub criteria: Staff and Leadership Team						
<i>Notes/Rationale:</i>						
<i>Score (0-100):</i> _____			<i>Evaluator Initials:</i> _____			
Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Staff and Leadership Team	100					

Evaluation Criteria 3 – Sub Criteria 2

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Resources</p>
<p><i>RFP Programmatic Proposal Instructions:</i></p> <p>Under the terms of any resulting contract, the Vendor shall administer, coordinate, and ensure availability and delivery of services in its respective awarded service area(s) (i.e. Pinellas County), and in some instances, neighboring counties as specified in any resulting contract.</p> <p>Services shall be provided, at a minimum, during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, Eastern Time Zone, except for state recognized holidays. Because many clients can be better served with extended hours, the Vendor is encouraged to offer evening and weekend service times.</p> <p>The Vendor will provide a description of the Vendor's organization, including number of years in business, subsidiaries, parent corporations, officers; include organizational charts and details concerning the number of facilities by geographic location.</p> <p>Describe the Vendor's existing support services network; include a list of the current service providers in the network and detail how these support services are beneficial to client success, the services they provide, and how the Vendor will facilitate clients' access to support services.</p> <p>Describe how additional service providers will be identified and collaborative relationships established. This should include how the project will reach out to traditionally non-refugee-serving agencies to create linkages in the community.</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> RFP Sections 3.2.15, 3.2.17 TAB 3: EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW TAB 4: SERVICES APPROACH AND SOLUTION, TAB 5: COMPANY QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vendor does an (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) job providing other services to refugees in the service area. • The Vendor does an (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) job providing other types of services in the service area that will benefit refugees. • The Vendor proposes service times which are convenient for clients, including a staff work schedule that reflects evening and weekend hours. • The Vendor describes in detail how it will work collaboratively with other refugee resettlement agencies and with other organizations that serve the refugee population. The Vendor describes its openness and ability to cooperate with these organizations. The Vendor presents letters of support and/or MOUs from these partner organizations.

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.</p>						
<p>Sub criteria: Resources</p>						
<p><i>Notes/Rationale:</i></p>						
<p><i>Score (0-50):</i> _____</p>				<p><i>Evaluator Initials:</i> _____</p>		
Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources 	50					

Financial Proposal Criteria – Sub Criteria 1

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Proposal)</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Financial Stability / Financial Management</p>
<p><i>RFP Financial Proposal Instructions:</i> The Vendor must describe its current financial management and accounting systems and capability by submitting copies of their independent financial and compliance audit report and/or certified financial statements for the two (2) most recent fiscal years. These documents must be contained in a 3-ring binder, separate from the rest of the proposal. The copies shall include all applicable financial statements, auditor's reports, management letters, and any corresponding re-issued audit components. If the Vendor does not have audit reports for the two (2) most recent years, reviewed or compiled financial statements with the applicable Certified Public Accountant's report shall be submitted. A newly created entity shall submit the requested financial reports from each of the founding collaborative partners.</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> TAB B: BUDGET</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>FINANCIAL STABILITY</u></p> <p>Copies of Vendors' independent financial and compliance audit reports and/or certified financial statements for the two most recent fiscal years. The copies should include all applicable financial statements, auditor's reports, management letters, and any corresponding re-issued audit components. If the Vendor does not have audit reports for the two most recent years, reviewed or compiled financial statements with the applicable Certified Public Accountant's report should be submitted. <u>A newly created entity should submit the requested financial reports from each of the founding collaborative partners.</u> Procedure for determining a score for financial stability where two or more agencies have come together to create a new entity: Score each agency's financial and compliance audits and/or certified financial statements, or where Vendors were not subject to audit requirements, their financial statements, independently of the other agencies. Once a score has been determined for each agency participating in the newly-created entity, total their scores and divide by the number of participating agencies to arrive at an average score.</p>

Criteria:
The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Proposal)

Sub criteria:
Financial Stability / Financial Management

Notes/Rationale:

Considerations: Please assign the point value achieved in each section below. The total score for sections a-f shall be used on the following Rating Sheet Summary Page for Financial Stability to assign the corresponding points.

<p><u>A Current Ratio</u> (Total Current Assets divided by Total Current Liabilities)</p> <p>1.75 or greater 5 points 1.25 or greater, but less than 1.75 3 points Greater than 1.00 but less than 1.25 1 point Less than or equal to 1.00 0 points</p>	a) Most Recent Year	
	b) 2 nd Most Recent Year	
<p><u>Months of Working Capital</u> (Total Current Assets Less Total Current Liabilities for the year divided by one twelfth of the total expenses for the year as of the date of the financial statement)</p> <p>1.75 or greater 5 points 1.25 or greater, but less than 1.75 3 points Greater than 0.80 but less than 1.25 1 point Less than or equal to 0.80 0 points</p>	c) Most Recent Year	
	d) 2 nd Most Recent Year	
<p><u>Independent Auditor's Report, Financial Statement Opinion</u></p> <p>Financial Statements "present fairly..." 5 points Financial Statements "present fairly...except (minor) 3 points Financial Statements "present fairly...except (major) 1 point Unaudited Financial Statements presented 1 point Financial Statements "do not present fairly..." 0 points</p>	e) Most Recent Year	
	f) 2 nd Most Recent Year	
(Total Possible = 30) ADDED SCORES:		

Score (0-30): _____

Evaluator Initials: _____

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Financial Stability / Financial Management	30					

Financial Proposal Criteria – Sub Criteria 2

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Proposal)</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Budget</p>
<p><i>RFP Financial Proposal Instructions:</i> The Vendor must submit detailed budget information. A Line Item Budget (Project Budget Summary), a Budget Narrative, a Fixed Price Budget Worksheet, and a Cost Allocation Plan must all be submitted with the proposal to the RFP. Each of these categories is described below. The actual budget documents can also be found in Appendix VII, VIII, IX, X and XI. Please contact the Procurement Manager listed in Section 1.4 to request Word or Excel versions of any of the forms found in the Appendices.</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> TAB B: BUDGET</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost proposal includes an organized and thorough narrative which provides good justifications, explains how each cost was determined, and compares how such costs relate to similar costs in the same geographic area. Taking into account the budget narrative, the Vendor's proposed budget appears reasonable and warranted. The Vendor includes an (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) and detailed Project Budget Summary (i.e. the line item budget). The Vendor clearly delineates proposed costs and describes all costs associated with various employment services. All staff costs needed to operate the program are identified. Staff costs include a rate of pay, the amount of time devoted to the program, a narrative of fringe benefits provided and how they are determined, and a comparison of how the costs identified compare to other service providers in the service area offering similar services. Allocations for personnel and any other line items in the Project Budget Summary are consistent with what was proposed in the Vendor's programmatic proposal. The estimated cost for individual line items is reasonable, allowable, and necessary. The Vendor submits an (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) Cost Allocation Plan that identifies the distribution of costs between funding sources and divides individual costs by category. The total amount for each federal fiscal year (FFY) is at or below the amount listed in Section 1.3 for all services in the Vendor's proposal. The Vendor presents a (superior, good, adequate, poor, or insufficient) and detailed Fixed Price Budget Worksheet that realistically estimates the cost of the various employment services components.

Department of Children and Families
Employment Services for Refugees and Entrants in
Pinellas County

Criteria:
The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Proposal)

Sub criteria:
Budget

- The Vendor has described in detail how it arrived at its indirect cost rate. The Vendor explains its methodology and justifies the reasonableness of the proposed indirect cost rate. The indirect cost rate does not exceed 10% of the total operating costs of the proposed program budget.

Notes/Rationale:

Score (0-140): _____ *Evaluator Initials:* _____

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Budget	140					

Financial Proposal Criteria – Sub Criteria 3

<p>Criteria: The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Proposal)</p>
<p>Sub criteria: Cost Comparison</p>
<p><i>RFP Financial Proposal Instructions:</i> N/A</p>
<p><i>RFP Related Text:</i> N/A</p>
<p><i>Guidance:</i> The Vendor's <i>cost per client served</i> as compared to the lowest proposed <i>cost per client served</i> from a Vendor providing similar services. The Department will first examine the Vendor's cost proposal and determine the Vendor's overall cost for services for the entire contract period. The Department will then determine how many clients the Vendor proposes to serve during that same contract period. The Department will divide the overall cost for services by the overall number of clients that the Vendor proposes to serve. This will provide the Department with the <i>cost per client served</i>. The Department will then consider all Vendors that have submitted a proposal and will determine the lowest average <i>cost per client served</i>. The lowest <i>cost per client served</i> will then be divided by each Vendor's <i>cost per client served</i>, and then multiplied by 30 to determine each Vendor's score for this criterion.</p>

Criteria: The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Proposal)						
Sub criteria: Cost Comparison						
Notes/Rationale: The Procurement Manager will assign a score corresponding to the Vendor's <i>cost per client served</i> for the project (see explanation above), relative to the lowest <i>cost per client served</i> of any responsive vendor responding to this RFP. The following formula will be used to calculate the score for this criterion: $(Lowest\ Cost\ per\ Client\ Served / Vendor's\ Cost\ per\ Client\ Served) \times Total\ Possible\ Score = Vendor's\ Score$						
Score (0-30): _____ Evaluator Initials: _____						
Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Cost Comparison	30					

Protests and Disputes

Failure to file a protest within the time prescribed in section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, or failure to post the bond or other security required by law within the time allowed for filing a bond shall constitute a waiver of proceedings under chapter 120, Florida Statutes.

PLEASE BE GOVERNED ACCORDINGLY.