State of Florida Department of Children and Families



ITN# - DCF ITN 2021 023 Domestic Violence Services

ITN Programmatic 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 programmatic evaluator will evaluate the programmatic 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 interrelationships, 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 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

- 1.10 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 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 GENERAL CRITERIA

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

General Criteria	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
Vendor articulates how domestic violence service provision supports the organization's mission.	4.2.4.1.1	12%	60	
Executive Overview				
(Insufficient – 12; Poor – 24; Adequate – 36; Good – 48; Exceptional – 60)				
2. Vendor articulates expertise and prior experience in domestic violence, including understanding of service provision models (7%), root causes of violence (5%), gender-based violence (5%), social change initiatives (5%), trauma-informed practices (4%) and culturally responsive services (4%).	4.2.4.2	30%	150	
Executive Overview				
Evaluate based on the below sub-criteria, for a total possible score of 150. Provide score for each criterion.				
a. understanding of service provision models (7%)				
(Insufficient – 7; Poor – 14; Adequate – 21; Good – 28; Exceptional – 35)				
b. root causes of violence (5%)				
(Insufficient – 5; Poor – 10; Adequate – 15; Good – 20; Exceptional – 25)				
c. gender-based violence (5%)				
(Insufficient – 5; Poor – 10; Adequate – 15; Good – 20; Exceptional – 25)				
d. social change initiatives (5%)				
(Insufficient – 5; Poor – 10; Adequate – 15; Good – 20; Exceptional – 25)				
e. trauma-informed practices (4%)				
(Insufficient – 4; Poor – 8; Adequate – 12; Good – 16; Exceptional – 20)				
f. culturally responsive services (4%)				
(Insufficient – 4; Poor – 8; Adequate – 12; Good – 16;				



General Criteria	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
Exceptional – 20)				
3. Vendor articulates efficient organization and governance structure with clear lines of authority, including corporate affiliations (10%); a lean, efficient, and effective administrative model (10%); and success developing a governance model designed to avoid conflicts of interest (5%).	4.2.4.2.1	25%	125	
Executive Overview				
Evaluator will score based on the below sub-criteria, for a total possible score of 125. Provide score for each criterion.				
a. corporate affiliations (10%)				
(Insufficient – 10; Poor – 20; Adequate – 30; Good – 40; Exceptional – 50)				
b. a lean, efficient, and effective administrative model (10%)				
(Insufficient – 10; Poor – 20; Adequate – 30; Good – 40; Exceptional – 50)				
c. success developing a governance model designed to avoid conflicts of interest (5%).				
(Insufficient – 5; Poor – 10; Adequate – 15; Good – 20; Exceptional – 25)				
4. Vendor provides sufficient detail on organization, including number of years in business, subsidiaries, parent corporations, officers; included organization charts and details concerning the number of facilities by geographic location.	4.2.4.2.2	13%	65	
Corporate Information				
(Insufficient – 13; Poor – 26; Adequate – 39; Good – 52; Exceptional – 65)				
5. The vendor articulates the qualifications and credentials of their leadership team (9%) with an explanation of why the leadership team is qualified to lead their organization in meeting the needs of this ITN (6%). Vendor included	4.2.5	20%	100	



General Criteria	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
résumés for key leadership personnel describing their work experience, education, and training as it relates to the specific service areas applied to (5%).				
Core Team Qualifications				
Evaluate based on the below sub-criteria, for a total possible score of 100. Provide score for each criterion.				
a. qualifications and credentials of their leadership team (9%)				
(Insufficient – 9; Poor – 18; Adequate – 27; Good – 36; Exceptional – 45)				
b. explanation of why the leadership team is qualified to lead their organization in meeting the needs of this ITN (6%)				
(Insufficient – 6; Poor – 12; Adequate – 18; Good – 24; Exceptional – 30)				
c. vendor included résumés for key leadership personnel describing their work experience, education, and training as it relates to the specific service areas applied to (5%)				
(Insufficient – 5; Poor – 10; Adequate – 15; Good – 20; Exceptional – 25)				
GENERAL CRITERIA TOTAL		100%	500	

Camana	Cuitouio	
	l Criteria	MOTES

Notes/Rationale:



3 PROGRAMMATIC REPLY POINT VALUES

The maximum score for the Programmatic Reply is 1,500 points. General Criteria maximum possible points 500, and Service Approach and Solution 1,000. As noted in the ITN, an additional 15% is awarded if all services can be provided. This calculation will be completed by the Procurement Officer.

	d Technical Assistance Criteria rvices Approach and Solution	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
trauma-infor Including, he maximum e linguistic se oppression bilingual/bic	nonstrates commitment to prioritizing rmed and culturally responsive services. ow the Vendor will provide to the xtent feasible, training on cultural and rvices, cultural barriers to services, social of marginalized groups, and the use of ultural staff to ensure adequate on of Florida's populations.	4.2.6 (A)(d) B-2.1 C-2 C-5.1	25%	250	
(Insufficient – 50; Pol Exceptional – 250)	or – 100; Adequate – :150 Good – 200;				
domestic vio developmer the solicitati		4.2.6 (A)(a) – (c) B-2.1 C-2 C-5.1	30%	300	
Co	nsider the following, when evaluating:	0-0.1			
a.	Did the Vendor describe the approach to providing training and technical assistance, including geographic service areas, format of training(s) and curriculum development practices? The Vendor must have included a 20-slide example PowerPoint training on domestic violence with the 15-page narrative response.				
b.	Did the Vendor describe how they will promote victim safety and reduce domestic violence crimes through intervention and prevention activities? Including any advocacy activities or focus areas?				
C.	Did the Vendor describe how they will implement and maintain each current statewide initiative and include any additional proposed areas for statewide development?				
(Insufficient – 60; Por Exceptional – 300)	or – 120; Adequate – 180; Good – 240;				



Training and Technical Assistance Criteria Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
8. Vendor demonstrates the ability to maintain a structure for statewide training to diverse audiences, including development of the Core Curriculum, training schedule for the mandatory 24-hour Core training, and executive leadership and Board of Directors' governance training opportunities for certified domestic violence centers and culturally specific organizations.	4.2.6 (A)(e) - (h) B-2.1 C-2 C-5.1	15%	150	
Consider the following, when evaluating:				
a. Did the Vendor describe how training and technical assistance will be made accessible to individuals with disabilities, individuals who are Deaf or hard of hearing, and persons with limited English proficiency?				
(Insufficient – 30; Poor – 60; Adequate – 90; Good – 120; Exceptional – 150)				
 Vendor articulates deliverables that promote comprehensive domestic violence training and technical assistance throughout Florida and demonstrates the ability to expand current training and technical assistance. 	4.2.6 (A)(i) and (j) B-2.1 C-2 C-5.1	15%	150	
Consider the following, when evaluating:				
a. Did the Vendor describe how they will identify emerging training needs and complete training and technical assistance in a time-responsive manner?				
b. Did the Vendor provide a timeline of all proposed deliverables to be met within the first three years of the contract? Did the Vendor describe in detail the specific tasks and activities necessary to accomplish each goal?				
(Insufficient – 30; Poor – 60; Adequate – 90; Good – 120; Exceptional – 150)				
 10. Vendor proposes performance measures that adequately reflect evaluation of the training and technical assistance program. (Insufficient – 20; Poor – 40; Adequate – 60; Good – 80; Exceptional – 100) 	4.2.6 (A)(k) B-2.1 C-2 C-5.1	10%	100	



Training and Technical Assistance Criteria Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
 11. Vendor demonstrates appropriate use of materials, publications, and tangible products to support the training and technical assistance program. (Insufficient – 10; Poor – 20; Adequate – 30; Good – 40; Exceptional – 50) 	4.2.6 (A)(I) B-2.1 C-2 C-5.1	5%	50	
TOTAL		100%	1000	

Training and Technical As	sistance Criteria Notes:	
Notes/Rationale:		

Legal Service Criteria Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
 Vendor demonstrates a sufficient approach to providing domestic violence legal services to the 	4.2.6 (B)(a) - (c)	30%	300	
certified domestic violence centers on confidentiality and privilege and employment issues, and in provid	I B-//			
oversight to the Florida Injunction for Protection	C-3			
Project.	C-5.2			
Consider the following, when evaluating:				
a. Did the Vendor describe how they won structure the Injunction for Protection (IFP) project managing attorneys' oversight of the statewide project?	ıld			
b. Did the vendor describe their approach to providing legal services? Did they include any legal services the Vendor	h			



Legal Service Criteria Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
currently provides or subcontracts to provide and how they may intersect with domestic violence service?				
(Insufficient – 60; Poor – 120; Adequate – 180; Good – 240; Exceptional – 300)				
13. Vendor demonstrates the capacity to conduct legal services as described in the solicitation, including meeting all legal requirements, expanding legal services offered and maintaining partnership with other domestic violence legal providers in Florida.	4.2.6 (B)(e) B-2.2 C-3 C-5.2	25%	250	
Consider the following, when evaluating:	0-3.2			
a. Did the Vendor describe how the Vendor will partner with other Florida legal service providers and the Department to enhance access to legal services for victims of domestic violence throughout Florida, including those identified in Part 2, Section C-1.2.3 . Please identify the providers the Vendor anticipates partnering with under this contract and/or already maintains a relationship with, as well as other potential funding sources for identified legal programs the Vendor will seek for providing legal services to victims.				
(Insufficient – 50; Poor – 100; Adequate – :150 Good – 200; Exceptional – 250)				
14. Vendor articulates the ability to conduct training and technical assistance that ensures cultural and linguistic accessible legal services, including recognition of cultural barriers, social oppression of marginalized populations and the use of bilingual/bicultural staff to ensure adequate representation of Florida's populations.	4.2.6 (B)(c) and (f) B-2.2 C-3 C-5.2	15%	150	
Consider the following, when evaluating:				
a. Did the Vendor describe how they will ensure all legal services are accessible to individuals with disabilities, individuals who are Deaf or hard of hearing, and persons with limited English proficiency?				
b. Did the Vendor describe how they will ensure the IFP Project Attorneys will be				



Legal Service Criteria Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
directed to provide cultural and linguistic accessible legal services, including recognition of cultural barriers and social oppression of marginalized populations, as well as the use of bilingual/bicultural staff to ensure adequate representation of Florida's populations?				
(Insufficient – 30; Poor – 60; Adequate – 90; Good – 120; Exceptional – 150)				
Vendor articulates deliverables that promote comprehensive domestic violence legal services throughout Florida and demonstrates the ability to expand current legal service programming. Consider the following, when evaluating:	4.2.6 (B)(g) and (h) B-2.2 C-3 C-5.2	15%	150	
a. Did the Vendor describe any additional legal services for victims of domestic violence or certified domestic violence centers the Vendor intends to provide under the scope of this contract, including any specific training and technical assistance to lawyers?				
b. Did the Vendor provide a timeline of all proposed deliverables to be met within the first three years of the contract, and describe in detail the specific tasks and activities necessary to accomplish each goal?				
(Insufficient – 30; Poor – 60; Adequate – 90; Good – 120; Exceptional – 150)				
Vendor proposes performance measures that adequately reflect evaluation of the Legal Services program.	4.2.6 (B)(i) B-2.2	10%	100	
(Insufficient – 20; Poor – 40; Adequate – 60; Good – 80; Exceptional – 100)	C-3 C-5.2			
 Vendor demonstrates appropriate use of materials, publications, and tangible products to support the Legal Services program. 	4.2.6 (B)(j) B-2.2	5%	50	
(Insufficient – 10; Poor – 20; Adequate – 30; Good – 40; Exceptional – 50)	C-3 C-5.2			



Legal Service Criteria Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
TOTAL		100%	1000	
egal Service Criteria Notes:				
Notes/Rationale:				

Florida Domestic Violence Hotline Criteria	Reference	Relative	Possible	Points
Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution		Value	Points	Awarded
18. Vendor demonstrates a satisfactory approach to managing a 24-hour domestic violence hotline, including staffing and staff performance evaluation, equipment, development of policies and procedures, and a schedule of all training required by hotline staff.	4.2.6 (C)(a) and (h)	25%	250	
	B-2.3			
	C-4			
(Insufficient – 50; Poor – 100; Adequate – 150; Good – 200; Exceptional – 250)	C-5.3			



Florida Domestic Violence Hotline Criteria	Reference	Relative	Possible	Points
Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution		Value	Points	Awarded
19. Vendor demonstrates use of a crisis intervention model that includes advocacy services, safety planning, coordination with certified domestic violence centers and other stakeholders, and describes how the Vendor would address unmet survivor needs on the hotline.	4.2.6 (C)(b) B-2.3 C-4 C-5.3	20%	200	
(Insufficient – 40; Poor – 80; Adequate – 120; Good – 160; Exceptional – 200)				
Vendor articulates the ability to ensure inclusive and accessible cultural and linguistic service provision,	4.2.6 (C)(c) and (e)	15%	150	
including recognition of cultural barriers, social oppression of marginalized communities and the use of	B-2.3			
bilingual/bicultural staff to ensure adequate representation	C-4			
of Florida's populations, and access to individuals with disabilities, individuals who are Deaf or hard of hearing, and persons with limited English proficiency.	C-5.3			
(Insufficient – 30; Poor – 60; Adequate – 90; Good – 120; Exceptional – 150)				
21. Vendor identifies confidentiality practices, includes data that hotline advocates would be required to collect, and	4.2.6 (C)(d) and (f)	10%	100	
describes partnership with the Department to identify gaps and trends.	B-2.3			
(Insufficient – 20; Poor – 40; Adequate – 60; Good – 80; Exceptional	C-4			
- 100)	C-5.3			
22. Vendor proposes performance measures that adequately	4.2.6 (C)(i)	15%	150	
reflect evaluation of the Florida Domestic Violence Hotline.	B-2.3			
(Insufficient – 30; Poor – 60; Adequate – 90; Good – 120; Exceptional – 150)	C-4			
,	C-5.3	400/	400	
23. Vendor articulates deliverables that promote comprehensive 24-hour operations of the Florida Domestic Violence Hotline.	4.2.6 (C)(g) B-2.3	10%	100	
Consider the following, when evaluating:	C-4			
a. Did the Vendor describe any training or technical assistance that will be provided regarding the provision of hotline services to certified domestic violence centers and community partners?	C-5.3			
 b. Provide a timeline of all proposed deliverables to be met within the first three years of the contract. Describe in detail the specific tasks and activities necessary to accomplish each goal. 				



Florida Domestic Violence Hotline Criteria Tab 5: Services Approach and Solution	Reference	Relative Value	Possible Points	Points Awarded
(Insufficient – 20; Poor – 40; Adequate – 60; Good – 80; Exceptional – 100)				
24. Vendor demonstrates appropriate use of materials,	4.2.6 (C)(j)	5%	50	
publications, and tangible products to support the Florida Domestic Violence Hotline.	B-2.3			
(Insufficient – 10; Poor – 20; Adequate – 30; Good – 40; Exceptional	C-4			
- 50)	C-5.3			
TOTAL		100%	1000	

TOTAL	100 /0	1000	
Florida Domestic Violence Hotline Criteria Notes:			
Notes/Rationale:			