

**ATTACHMENT E**  
**RFP#: R-89-17-0871**  
**Technical Proposal Score Sheet**

**PHASE I: Initial Qualifying Criteria**

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	RFP Section Reference	YES	NO
1	Was the vendor’s proposal received by the deadline as specified in the RFP?	1.5/5.1		
2	Did the vendor submit a proposal comprised of a Technical Proposal and, in a separate, appropriately labeled, sealed envelope, a Cost Proposal?	5.1		
3	Vendor’s proposal includes all required affirmative statements and certifications, signed by the vendor’s responsible representative, as described in Attachment A to the RFP?	VIII(A)		
4	Included in those certifications, the vendor states that it is not excluded from entering into a contract with ODJFS, due to restrictions related to the federal debarment list, unfair labor findings, or R.C. § 9.24.	VIII(A)		
5	ODJFS’ review of the Auditor of State website verifies that the vendor is not excluded from contracting with ODJFS by R.C. § 9.24 for an unresolved finding for recovery.	4.18		
6	Did the review team (in its initial/cursory review of the vendor’s proposal) determine that the proposal was free of trade secret/proprietary information as specified/restricted in the RFP?	4.5		
7	Vendors proposal indicates that (as an organization or as individuals) the vendor has completed at least five different government entity (i.e. state or county) assessments of the food stamp program.	2.1		

**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 Family Stability. 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 RFP, 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 **512** points (a score which represents that it “meets” all the evaluation criteria) out of a maximum of **638** 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	RFP SEC. REF.	Weighting	Doesn’t Meet 0	Partially Meets 6	Meets 8	Exceeds 10
<b>REQ. VENDOR INFO. &amp; CERTIFICATIONS</b>							
1	The vendor has included, properly completed and signed, the Required Vendor Information & Certifications as specified in the RFP.	VIII(A)	1				
<b>VENDOR QUALIFICATIONS</b>							
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE &amp; CAPABILITIES</b>							
1	The proposal contains documentation of at least two, but no more than four, similar sized projects completed by lead project staff in the past five years that demonstrate expertise in increasing payment accuracy rates within the food stamp program and which demonstrate experience in analyzing and recommending changes resulting from QC analysis.	2.2(1)	3				
2	The vendor included names and contact information for at least two entities for which lead project staff have performed similar large scale projects in the past three years.	2.2(2)	2				

<b>STAFF EXPERIENCE &amp; CAPABILITIES</b>							
1	The vendor has identified, by position and by name, the/those staff considered key to the project's success.	2.3(1)	2				
2	The vendor has demonstrated that the individual identified as the project manager possesses at least five years of project management experience in the field of improving active and negative payment accuracy.	2.3(2)	3				
3	The vendor has demonstrated that the individual identified for policy consultation must possess at least two years of policy consultation experience with the food stamp program either at the state or federal level. (One person may fulfill both requirements for #'s 2 & 3.)	2.3(2)	3				
4	The vendor has demonstrated previous experience conducting reviews of Quality Control (QC) errors for the food stamp program.	2.3(3)	3				
5	The vendor has demonstrated the knowledge of the FNS Handbook 310 requirements.	2.3(3)	3				
6	The vendor has demonstrated previous experience in selecting and applying the methods that are best suited to improve Ohio's Food Stamp program.	2.3(3)	3				
7	The vendor has demonstrated that the lead project staff assigned to the project have technical expertise in guiding innovative state specific "error review teams" who have documented success in improving payment accuracy.	2.3(4)	3				
<b>SCOPE OF WORK</b>							
1	The vendor has demonstrated experience in evaluating and identifying areas of change in the quality control area.	3.1	3				
2	The vendor has demonstrated experience in improving the food stamp payment accuracy error rate through recommendations for policy and procedure changes.	3.1	3				
3	The vendor has demonstrated experience in assisting with the implementation of selected recommendations.	3.1	2				
<b>SPECIFICATIONS OF DELIVERABLES</b>							
1	The vendor has included the work plan to review the QC active and negative error findings from FFY 2007 and to date in FFY2008.	3.2(A1)	3				
2	The vendor has included in their cost proposal for their participation in the state error review team meetings via teleconference.	3.2(A2)	2				
3	The vendor has included the work plan and timeline for reviewing and assessing Ohio's application of the FNS Handbook 310.	3.2(A3)	3				
4	The vendor agreed to further consultation at the conclusion of the RFP	3.2(A4)	2				
5	The applicant has demonstrated the capacity to provide training to QC case management analysts and supervision.	3.2(B)	3				
6	The vendor has described in adequate detail how they propose to accomplish each of the sub-components under the section 3.2C.	3.2 (C )	2				
7	The vendor has included a work plan to assist ODJFS with the implementation of the selected recommendations and suggestions, and included in the work plan up to two trainings for state staff.	3.2(D1)	2				
8	The vendor has demonstrated the capacity to provide training to county staff on the QC procedural changes.	3.2(D2)	1				

ADMIN. STRUCTURES—PROPOSED WORK PLAN							
	The vendor has stated the key objectives of the <u>proposed</u> project and has not simply restated the objectives as identified in this RFP.	2.4 A.	2				
	The vendor has provided a technical approach and work plan to be implemented which includes a proposed timeline for the project.	2.4 B.	3				
	The vendor has provided a status reporting procedure for reporting work completed, and resolution of unanticipated problems.	2.4 C.	3				
	The vendor has provided a current organizational chart (including any subcontractors) and specify the key management and administrative personnel who will be assigned to this project.	2.4 D.	2				
	The vendor has provided a timeline for each component of the scope of work and the project overall including the staff hours for personnel involved; included a Table of Organization (including any subcontractors) and a chart showing the number of hours devoted to the project by vendor or sub-contractor staff and has provided the percentage of time each key management person will devote to the project.	2.4 E.	2				
TRADE SECRET INFORMATION							
	The review team in its comprehensive review of the vendor's proposal has determined that the proposal was free of trade secret/proprietary information as specified/restricted in the RFP. [A "no" response will disqualify the vendor's proposal and will not advance to the consideration of the vendor's Cost Proposal.]				YES	NO	
Column Subtotal of "Partially Meets" points							
Column Subtotal of "Meets" points							
Column Subtotal of "Exceeds" points							
<b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>							

**Based upon the 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 512 points.)**

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

If yes, has the vendor provided evidence of having an Ohio presence? If there is no demonstrated Ohio presence, the vendor's proposal advances to Phase III review but the final technical score remains unchanged. If there is a demonstrated Ohio presence, the vendor's technical score is increased by ten (10) points for the Phase III review.

PHASE II B.— Additional Consideration for an Ohio Presence	4.24 & 6.1, B.	NO – Phase II A technical score unchanged	YES - Phase II A technical score plus 10 pts.
Has the vendor provided evidence of having an Ohio presence?			
<b>GRAND TOTAL SCORE [Phase II A. + Phase II B. score]:</b>			