

ATTACHMENT E
RLB#: R-89-07-0944
Technical Proposal Score Sheet

DUR DIRECTOR

PHASE I: Initial Qualifying Criteria

Pharmacist Name: _____

The proposal must meet all of the following Phase I proposal acceptance criteria in order to be considered for further evaluation. Any proposal receiving a “no” response to any of the following qualifying criteria **shall be disqualified from consideration**.

ITEM	PROPOSAL ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA	RLB Section Reference	YES	NO
1	Was the vendor’s proposal received by the deadline as specified in the RLB?	II. and III.		
2	Did the vendor submit six (6) paper copies and one electronic copy of their Technical Proposal in a packet labeled: “PROPOSAL ENCLOSED FOR DUR [DIRECTOR AND/OR COMMITTEE MEMBER] SERVICES, RLB#: R-89-07-0944 SUBMITTED BY [INDIVIDUAL’S NAME –OR- ORGANIZATION’S NAME WITH NAME OF PHARMACIST HERE]?” –AND- one electronic copy of their Cost Proposal (in a separate sealed envelope) labeled: “NOTE: DO NOT OPEN. COST PROPOSAL ENCLOSED FOR DUR DIRECTOR SERVICES, RLB#: R-89-07-0944 SUBMITTED BY [INDIVIDUAL’S NAME –OR- ORGANIZATION’S NAME WITH NAME OF PHARMACIST HERE]?”	IX., C. X.		
3	Does the vendor’s proposal include all required affirmative statements and certifications, signed by the vendor’s responsible representative, as described in Attachments A., and C. to the RLB?	XA. Attach. A. Attach. C.		
4	According to those certifications, does the vendor affirmatively indicate that it is not on the federal debarment list; that there are no unfair labor findings against it; and it is not in violation of ORC Section 9.24, and therefore may enter into a contract with ODJFS?	XI., M. Attach. A.		
5	Does ODJFS’ review of the Auditor of State website verify that the vendor is not excluded from contracting with ODJFS by ORC Section 9.24 for an unresolved finding for recovery (<i>i.e.</i> , the proposal of any vendor whose name appears on the Auditor’s website as having an unresolved finding for recovery will be eliminated from further consideration.)?	XI., K. Attach. A.		
6	Is the vendor (individual or proposed pharmacist) licensed to practice pharmacy in Ohio who has experience with drug utilization review? Has the vendor provided a copy of their Ohio pharmacy licensure?	V., A.		

PHASE II: Criteria for Scoring of Technical Proposal

Qualifying technical proposals will be collectively scored by a Proposal Review Team (PRT) appointed by ODJFS, Office of Ohio Health Plans. For each of the evaluation criteria given in the following score sheet, reviewers will collectively judge whether the technical proposal exceeds, meets, partially meets or does not meet the requirements expressed in the RLB, and assign the appropriate point value, as follows:

0	6	8	10
Does Not Meet Requirement	Partially Meets Requirement	Meets Requirement	Exceeds Requirements

A technical proposal’s total PHASE II score will be the sum of the point value for all the evaluation criteria. The review team will collectively score each individual qualifying proposal. Technical proposals which do not meet or exceed a total score of at least **88** points (a score which represents that it “meets” all the evaluation criteria) out of a maximum of **114** points, will be disqualified from further consideration, and its cost proposal will neither be opened nor considered. Only those vendors whose Technical Proposals meet or exceed the minimum required technical points will advance to PHASE III of the technical proposal score sheet.

ITEM #	EVALUATION CRITERIA	RLB SEC. REF.	Weighting	Doesn't Meet 0	Partially Meets 6	Meets 8	Exceeds 10
REQ. VENDOR INFO. & CERTIFICATIONS							
1	The vendor has included, properly completed and signed, the Required Vendor Information & Certifications as specified in the RLB.	XA. Attach. A.	0.50				
VENDOR QUALIFICATIONS							
VENDOR EXPERIENCE & CAPABILITIES							
2	The vendor has included curriculum vita or resume outlining relevant experience.	V., B., 1., a.	1				
3	The vendor has provided a statement of how the vendor (individual/proposed pharmacist) qualifies to perform drug utilization review activities.	V., B., 1., b.	1				
4	The vendor has demonstrated experience with retrospective DUR.	V., B., 1., c.	1				
5	The vendor has demonstrated experience with Medicaid (not necessarily Ohio Medicaid).	V., B., 1., d.	1				
6	The vendor has demonstrated experience reviewing patient medical history and making recommendations for therapy improvement.	V., B., 1., e.	1				
7	The vendor has demonstrated experience participating on a Medicaid or other health payer DUR Committee, Pharmacy & Therapeutics Committee, or similar committee.	V., B., 1., f.	1				
8	The vendor has provided examples of educational materials, treatment guidelines, intervention letters, and other relevant documents that have been prepared by the vendor (proposed pharmacist).	V., B., 1., g.	2				
9	The vendor has demonstrated experience with development of program policy, specifically utilization criteria and cost savings.	V., B., 1., h.	2				
SCOPE OF WORK & SPEC. OF DELIVERABLES							
10	The vendor has included individual affirmations (responses must address each element separately) that they will perform each task and deliverable as required in Section VI., Scope of Work and Section VII., Specifications of Deliverables, of this RLB.	VI., A. VII., A.	1				
Column Subtotal of "Partially Meets" points							
Column Subtotal of "Meets" points							
Column Subtotal of "Exceeds" points							
GRAND TOTAL SCORE:							

Based upon the Grand Total Technical Score earned, does the vendor's proposal proceed to the Phase III evaluation of its Cost Proposal? (Vendor's Grand Total Technical Score must be at least 88 points.)

Yes _____

No _____

(If "No," Vendor's Cost Proposal will not be opened.)