

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



**ITN# - DCF ITN 2021 023**  
**Domestic Violence Services**

**ITN Financial Evaluation Manual**

Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Vendor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Reply Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Effective Date: July 31, 2020  
(PMT-10-2021)

## 1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 Each Financial evaluator will evaluate the Financial reply for all vendor replies that pass the mandatory criteria. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. 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 using the scale provided.
- 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.	Exceptional	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 Financial 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 replies provided by the Department. Each evaluator will also be

---

provided with a copy of each Financial 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 Officer. If such an attempt is made by the Procurement Officer, 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 replies only from the Procurement Officer and Subject Matter Experts via the Procurement Officer.
- 1.9 Questions related to the solicitation and the evaluations of the reply should be directed only to:  

Kimberly McMahon, Procurement Officer  
Florida Department of Children and Families  
2415 North Monroe Street, Suite 400 – Room G203  
Tallahassee, Florida 32303  
E-Mail Address: [Kimberly.McMahon@myflfamilies.com](mailto:Kimberly.McMahon@myflfamilies.com)
- 1.10 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each Financial reply, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Officer for compilation. The Procurement Officer will average the total programmatic point scores and the total financial point scores. The Procurement Officer will then add the programmatic reply points score to the financial reply point scores to obtain a total score. The Procurement Officer will consider any additional points awarded for providing all services and use the total points to rank vendors.
- 1.11 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the replies, the Procurement Officer 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 scores.

## 2 FINANCIAL CRITERIA

The maximum score for the Financial Reply is 350 points.

Criteria	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
1. The Vendor's financial management approach, including proposed service efficiencies and re-investment and ongoing approach to reduce administrative costs and expand services.  (Insufficient – 21; Poor – 42; Adequate – 63; Good – 84; Exceptional – 105)	4.3.2.1 4.3.2.2 4.3.2.3	30%	105	
2. The Vendor's proposed budget.  (Insufficient – 49; Poor – 98; Adequate – 147; Good – 196; Exceptional – 245)	4.3.3 C -5.5.2 C-5.13	70%	245	
<b>TOTAL</b>		100%	350	

### Financial Criteria Notes:

Notes/Rationale: