

## SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBER COURSE OF CONDUCT

Please review and adhere to this course of conduct for members of a selection committee.

Selection committee members shall have no contact with any employee of a company or person representing a company submitting a proposal to the county. This includes casual discussions in social settings, requests for information, or offers to clarify or expand upon the Request for Proposals (RFP). Any questions from a proposed vendor or communications from a proposed vendor shall be directed to the buyer for the RFP.

If committee members have on-going projects that involve members of firms submitting proposals, conversations on those projects shall be carefully limited to avoid discussion of an RFP.

Committee members may receive no gratuities from proposers, their officers or employees, or individuals representing them. Please refer and County Ordinance 2.07 "County Ethics Code" and to State Law 63G-6a-2301 "Unlawful Conduct and Penalties."

Committee members are charged with carefully evaluating each proposal. Members must have a firm understanding of the RFP and the criteria pursuant to which proposals are to be evaluated. Proposals must be ranked consistent with those criteria.

Finally, committee members shall neither discuss nor disclose to the public or to county employees the identity of other committee members, information submitted in a proposal, discussions or recommendations issued by the selection committee.

If there are any questions with respect to any component of this procurement process, please contact the Director of Contracts & Procurement.

## COMMITTEE MEMBER HANDBOOK EXPEDITED REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

### I. INTRODUCTION

This handbook is written to assist you, as a member of an proposal selection committee, in understanding the policies, principles, evaluation procedures, criteria and scoring mechanisms for proposals received in response to an Expedited Request for Proposals (RFP).

### II. EVALUATION GUIDELINES

#### Principal #1

*Reasonable steps must be taken to eliminate biases and allow for variations in the proposers responding style to ensure a fair and equitable evaluation.*

During the evaluation, it is important to treat all proposers fairly and equally, and to evaluate their proposals in accordance with the process described in the RFP. Care must be taken throughout the process not to take any actions or make decisions that could be construed as providing an unfair advantage to any proposers.

Committee members are to review and evaluate each proposal on behalf and in the best interest of the County. Each committee member shall use the same evaluation measures or standards on all eligible proposals. The same level of effort should be extended to the evaluation of all proposals received.

Principle #2

*The selection committee and their responsibilities.*

A selection committee is made up of people deemed appropriate for the selection of the specific RFP (typically county staff). The selection committee should consist of two to three members. The Agency Lead will serve as the chair.

Each committee member should be present for the entire evaluation period and involved in reviewing and scoring all proposals and attending the committee meeting. Attendance is critical to the quality of the evaluation process.

A Conflict of Interest Statement will be required from each committee member disclosing all personal or financial interest conflicts that might exist. If the disclosed interest of any committee member presents a conflict that the selection committee determines to be prejudicial to the selection process if that member participates, the selection committee may dismiss that member from the committee.

Principle #3

*Only information provided with a proposal can be used to evaluate that proposal.*

If a proposer provides an unclear response, the Agency Lead will contact Contracts and Procurement to determine if a clarifying interview may be needed.

Committee members cannot seek major new pieces of information, which would *materially improve* the proposal, or change the scope of the proposal. For example, suppose a proposer provides a project schedule with only 4 milestones. It is not appropriate to contact the firm and indicate that the plan was inadequate and request a new, more detailed plan, one with at least 20 milestones.

Principle #4

*Committee members shall perform each evaluation step independent of the others and each committee member must be impartial in evaluating the proposals.*

A committee member should not finalize scores until the whole committee has had an opportunity to discuss the proposals, but each member should determine his or her own evaluation score.

As the evaluation process is considered confidential, it is imperative that the committee members be aware of the need for confidentiality. Members are expected to:

- a. Refrain from discussing the proposals or disclosing their contents to anyone other than their fellow committee members.
- b. Keep all notes, discussions, and point ratings confidential and not disclose their substance or details to others.
- c. Evaluate the proposals strictly in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in the RFP.
- d. Refrain from conversations with proposers concerning the RFP or selection process.

### III. PROPOSED SCORING SYSTEM

The committee members will individually evaluate and numerically score each proposal in accordance with the evaluation criteria described in the RFP. Each member will be provided with score sheets. Prior to the committee meeting, each member will review the proposals, make notes and score accordingly. The final scores will be established at the committee meeting by a process of discussion among the members. Committee members may want to **use pencil** on their scoring sheets and then finalize after the discussion.

Committee members individually score the proposals following the guidelines below and rank them 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, etc. according to their total score. The committee chair then transfers the individual rankings to a master ranking sheet and totals them to determine who is 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, etc.

As each committee member is individually scoring the proposals, the following is suggested:

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| Excellent  | If the proposal offer exceeds expectations, with an excellent probability of success in achieving all requirements of the RFP, and is very innovative; a score of “5” should be given. |
| Good       | If the proposal offers a very good probability of success, achieves all requirements of the RFP in a reasonable fashion; a score of “4” should be given.                               |
| Acceptable | If the proposal offers a reasonable probability of success, but some of the requirements may not be met; the item should be scored “3.”  |
| Poor       | If the proposal offer falls short of expectations and has a low probability of success; the item should be scored a “1 or 2.”  |

Unacceptable If the approach completely fails the requirements; the item should receive a score of "0."

**IV. REFERENCES**

References may be checked by the Agency Lead for the top-ranked proposals.

**V. CONFIDENTIALITY OF PROPOSALS**

All proposals and their contents are considered a confidential protected record and shall not be discussed with anyone outside the selection committee, i.e., staff members, suppliers, proposers, media, etc.

Any requests received by committee member or the end using agency to view proposals, score sheets, or the agreement shall be directed to Contracts and Procurement. Contracts and Procurement will require an official "records request" from the requestor.