

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



RFP# - DCFRFP2021014

**Functional Family Therapy
Training**

RFP Financial Evaluation Manual

Evaluator Name: _____

Vendor Name: _____

Date of Response Evaluation: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____

1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 Each financial evaluator will evaluate the financial response 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(s) 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 response. The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores:

IF, in your judgment the response demonstrates and/or describes...	Category	Points
...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	4
...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	3
...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	2
...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	1
...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

- 1.3 When completing score sheets financial evaluators should record references to the sections of the Request for Proposal (RFP) and the written response 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 response 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 financial response 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 response 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 The Procurement Officer 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 Officer and Subject Matter Experts via the Procurement Officer.
- 1.10 Questions related to the solicitation and the evaluations of the response should be directed only to:

Dineen Cicco, Procurement Officer
Florida Department of Children and Families
Office of Substance Abuse and Mental Health
2415 North Monroe Street, Suite 400-B109
Tallahassee, FL 32303
E-Mail Address: Dineen.Cicco@myflfamilies.com
- 1.11 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each financial response, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Officer for compilation. The Procurement Officer will average the total financial point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section along with the programmatic scoring for

Department of Children and Families
Functional Family Therapy
Training

each vendor. Programmatic scoring is conducted by programmatic evaluators. The two scores are added together with the highest scorer being awarded.

- 1.12 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 RESPONSE POINT VALUES

The maximum score for the Financial Response is 16 points.

Financial Criteria	Maximum Points
• Proposed Service Efficiencies and re-investment	4
• Line Item Budget	4
• Line Item Budget Narrative	4
• Deliverable Cost Proposal	4
Total	16

Department of Children and Families
Functional Family Therapy
Training

Evaluation Criteria I – Financial Information

Reference	Sub-Criteria (Maximum Possible Points 16)	Score (Max = 4)	Weight	Points Awarded
Sections 4.3.2.1 and 4.3.2.2	1. The adequacy of the vendor's proposed service efficiencies and re-investment and in providing any type of volume purchasing discount.		1	
Section 4.3.2.4	2. The adequacy of the proposed line item budget in outlining the costs associated with the provision of services.		1	
Sections 3.2.2 and 4.3.2.4	3. The adequacy of the vendor's line item budget narrative in providing sufficient information and a cost breakdown methodology to support the costs in each line-item, including costs that are reasonable, allowable, and necessary for the services to be provided.		1	
Section 4.3.2.5	4. The adequacy of the vendor's deliverable cost proposal in outlining the deliverables, number of units and unit rates.		1	
			TOTAL	

Evaluation Criteria I – Financial Information

Notes/Rationale: