

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



**ITN# - DCF ITN 2021 008
Community-Based Care Lead Agency for Circuits 2 and 14**

ITN Programmatic Evaluation Manual

Evaluator Name: _____

Vendor Name: _____

Date of Reply Evaluation: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____

1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 Each programmatic 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.	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 programmatic 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 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 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 reply should be directed only to:
Kimberly Houlios, Procurement Officer
Florida Department of Children and Families
Office of Contracted Client Services
2415 North Monroe St., Suite G203
Tallahassee, FL 32303
E-Mail Address: Kimberly.Houlios@myflfamilies.com
- 1.11 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each programmatic reply, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Officer for compilation. The Procurement Officer will average the total programmatic point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section along with the financial scoring for each vendor. Financial scoring is conducted by either financial evaluators or a formula. 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 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 700 points.

Programmatic Criteria	Relative Value	Possible Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vendor’s articulation of their solution approach and the ability of the solution to meet the requirements of services outlined in DEPARTMENT’S SUPPLEMENTAL CONTRACT- EXHIBIT C (APPENDIX IX) and reply requirements of Tab 5: Services Approach and Solutions, including the ability to provide any additional value. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Services Approach and Solution 	40%	400
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vendor’s organization, ability to complete Scope of Work services, management of Performance Specifications, and means of completing Deliverables as defined in the DEPARTMENT’S SUPPLEMENTAL CONTRACT (APPENDIX IX). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Executive Overview 	15%	150
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The skills and experience of the vendor’s leadership team, staff, and resources the vendor will use in implementing its solution. leadership credentials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Core Team Qualifications 	15%	150
TOTAL	70%	700

Department of Children and Families
Community-Based Care Lead Agency for Circuits 2 and 14

Reference	Programmatic Criteria I- Service Approach and Solution (Possible Points 400)	Total Possible Points	Points Awarded
Section 4.2.6.	The vendor shall describe the approach to performing the tasks described in the DEPARTMENT'S SUPPLEMENT CONTRACT- EXHIBIT C (APPENDIX IX) and how it will meet all the Department's detailed requirements. The vendor must describe in detail how these subcontracted vendors will also be capable of meeting the Department's detailed requirements and the requirements of section 409.988(1)(j), F.S. The vendor must outline how various services and subcontracts will be managed in Franklin, Gadsden, Jefferson, Leon, Liberty, Wakulla, Bay, Calhoun, Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, and Washington Counties, and how subcontractors will be held accountable if performance standards are not met.		
Safety			
Section 4.2.6. A-1 (a)	1. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Prevention Services? (Insufficient – 6.6; Poor – 13.2; Adequate –19.8; Good – 26.4; Exceptional – 33)	100	
Section 4.2.6. A-1 (b)	2. The adequacy of the vendors replies regarding Child Protection Tasks? (Insufficient – 6.6; Poor – 13.2; Adequate –19.8; Good – 26.4; Exceptional – 33)		
Section 4.2.6. A-1 (c)	3. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Safety Management and Family Preservation Services? (Insufficient – 6.8; Poor – 13.6; Adequate –20.4; Good – 27.2; Exceptional – 34)		
Permanency			
Section 4.2.6. A-2 (a)	4. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Adoption Services? (Insufficient – 6; Poor – 12; Adequate – 18; Good – 24; Exceptional – 30)	90	
Section 4.2.6. A-2 (b)	5. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Placement Services? (Insufficient – 6; Poor – 12; Adequate – 18; Good – 24; Exceptional – 30)		
Section 4.2.6. A-2 (c)	6. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Guardianship Assistance Program (GAP)? (Insufficient – 6; Poor – 12; Adequate – 18; Good – 24; Exceptional – 30)		
Well-Being			
Section 4.2.6. A- 3(a)	7. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Education? (Insufficient – 5.4; Poor –10.8; Adequate – 16.2; Good – 21.6; Exceptional – 27)	80	
Section 4.2.6. A- 3(b)	8. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Services for Transitioning Youth and Young Adults? (Insufficient – 5.2; Poor – 10.4; Adequate – 15.6; Good – 20.8; Exceptional – 26)		

**Department of Children and Families
Community-Based Care Lead Agency for Circuits 2 and 14**

Section 4.2.6. A- 3(c)	9. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Health Services? (Insufficient – 5.4; Poor –10.8; Adequate – 16.2; Good – 21.6; Exceptional – 27)		
Management			
Section 4.2.6. A- 4(a)	10. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Licensing Tasks? (Insufficient – 3.2; Poor – 6.4; Adequate – 9.6; Good – 12.8; Exceptional – 16)	65	
Section 4.2.6. A- 4(b)	11. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Quality Assurance (QA) and Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)? (Insufficient – 3.2; Poor – 6.4; Adequate – 9.6; Good – 12.8; Exceptional – 16)		
Section 4.2.6. A- 4(c)	12. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Other Service System Tasks? (Insufficient – 3.2; Poor – 6.4; Adequate – 9.6; Good – 12.8; Exceptional – 16)		
Section 4.2.6. A- 4(d)	13. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding General Management? (Insufficient – 3.4; Poor – 6.8; Adequate – 10.2; Good – 13.6; Exceptional –17)		
Staffing			
Section 4.2.6. B-1 (a)	14. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Staffing Requirements? (Insufficient – 6.6; Poor – 13.2; Adequate – 19.8; Good – 26.4 Exceptional – 33)	65	
Section 4.2.6. B-1 (b)	15. The adequacy of the vendor's reply regarding Staffing Changes? (Insufficient – 6.4; Poor – 12.86; Adequate – 19.2; Good – 26.6 Exceptional – 32)		
TOTAL		400	

Programmatic Criteria I – Business/Corporate Experience and Qualifications

Notes/Rationale:

Reference	Programmatic Criteria II – Executive Overview (Possible Points 150)	Total Possible Points	Points Awarded
Section 4.2.4	A brief executive overview demonstrating an understanding of the ITN, ITN purpose, and the needs specified in ITN, as well as, a brief description of the vendor’s organization, ability to complete Scope of Work services, management of Performance Specifications, and means of completing Deliverables as defined in the DEPARTMENT’S SUPPLEMENTAL CONTRACT-EXHIBIT D (APPENDIX IX) .		
Section 4.2.4.1.1.	1. To what extent does the vendor’s reply describe vendor’s approach and philosophy, including mission statement, core values, and vision? (Insufficient – 6.6; Poor – 13.2; Adequate –19.8; Good – 26.4; Exceptional – 33)	33	
Section 4.2.4.1.2.	2. To what extent does the vendor’s reply describe vendor’s organization and governance structure, depicting clear lines of authority including corporate affiliations; describe how the structure represents a lean, efficient, and effective administrative model; describe experience and achievements in developing a governance model is designed to avoid conflicts of interest? (Insufficient – 7.2; Poor – 14.4; Adequate – 21.6; Good – 28.8; Exceptional – 36)	36	
Section 4.2.4.1.3.	3. To what extent does the vendor’s reply demonstrate the vendor’s and subcontractor(s)' ability to successfully complete the work described in the ITN and its appendices, attachments, exhibits, and referenced supporting documentation. The vendor's and any proposed subcontractor(s)' information shall be shown separately? (Insufficient – 9; Poor – 18; Adequate – 27; Good –36; Exceptional – 45)	45	
Section 4.2.4.2	4. To what extent does the vendor’s reply describe the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full legal name and its associated Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN), or individual identification number if a FEIN is not required; • Proof of registration with MFMP; • Country and state of incorporation; • Principal place of business; 	36	

Reference	Programmatic Criteria III – Core Team Qualifications (Possible Points 150)	Total Possible Points	Points Awarded
Section 4.2.5.1.	<p>1. To what extent does the vendor’s reply describe the qualifications and credentials of their leadership team with an explanation of why the leadership team is qualified to lead their organization in meeting the needs of this ITN? Does the vendor include résumés for key leadership personnel describing their work experience, education, and training as it relates to the requirements of this ITN and the DEPARTMENT’S STANDARD CONTRACT AND SUPPLEMENTAL CONTRACT (APPENDIX VIII and APPENDIX IX)?</p> <p>(Insufficient – 15, Poor – 30; Adequate –45; Good –60, Exceptional – 75)</p>	75	
Section 4.2.5.2.	<p>2. To what extent does the vendor’s reply provide the vendor’s operational approach to the recruitment, training, supervision, and retention of qualified personnel as described in the DEPARTMENT’S STANDARD CONTRACT AND SUPPLEMENTAL CONTRACT (APPENDIX VIII and APPENDIX IX)? Does the reply address all applicable personnel grievance and conflict resolution practices? Additionally, does the reply explain how the vendor’s organization, subcontractors, and staffing levels will best meet the performance standards required to perform properly? Does the vendor describe the credentials for human resources, quality assurance, financial, information technology, and other key professional level employees?</p> <p>(Insufficient – 15, Poor – 30; Adequate –45; Good –60, Exceptional – 75)</p>	75	
TOTAL		150	

Programmatic Criteria II – Service Delivery Approach
Notes/Rationale: