



Subject: Course of Conduct and Action

Dear Selection Committee Members:

Please review and adhere to this course of conduct and action by 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 which 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 to 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.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE MEMBER HANDBOOK

I. INTRODUCTION

This Handbook is written to assist you, as a member of a proposal Selection Committee, in understanding the policies, principles, evaluation procedures, criteria and scoring mechanisms for proposals received in response to a 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 make-up and their responsibilities.

A Selection Committee is made up of County Agency members and any other qualified community representatives as deemed appropriate for the selection of the specific RFP. The Selection Committee should consist of five to six Members. There should be a mix of Members, not all from one Agency. Contracts and Procurement will serve as the Chair of the Committee. The Chair will be a non-scoring Member.

Each Committee Member should be present for the entire evaluation period: involved in reviewing and scoring all proposals, attend the Committee Meeting, and attend all interviews of the proposers. 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 Chair of the Selection Committee may contact the Proposer to clarify an apparent contradiction.

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 their scores until the whole Committee has had an opportunity to discuss the proposals, but each Member should make up their own mind as to the proper 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. not discuss the proposals or disclose 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. not have conversations with Proposers concerning the RFP or selection process

III. STEPS IN THE PROCESS

Prior to Issuance of Request for Proposal

- Agency and Contracts and Procurement conduct a pre-development meeting
- Agency prepares Issue Notification document
- Preparation of the Request for Proposals by Agency in conjunction with Contracts & Procurement

Issuance of the Request for Proposals by Contracts and Procurement

- Release of RFP
- Notification e-mail to Department Director, Auditor, Attorney, Council, and Mayor
- Notify Selection Committee Members of meeting dates

Receipt of the Proposals

- Proposals received by Contracts & Procurement
- Distribution of proposal packets to Selection Committee Members

Evaluation/Selection Process

- Committee Members shall carefully read each proposal and fill out a score sheet
- Committee s Meeting: The purpose of the meeting is to resolve differences and to ensure all Members share the same understanding of each proposal. The hope is to resolve differences in individual scores, not simply to average the scores.
- Interviews with top ranked Proposers selected by the Committee Members
- Request for best and final offer (if needed)
- Final evaluation and ranking by Committee Members

Award Phase

- Recommendation to enter into a contract submitted to the Mayor or Designee
- Preparation of agreement by the District Attorney's office
- Signing of contract by vendor
- Signing of contract by Mayor or Designee

IV. 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 (See sample score sheet at the end of this document). Prior to the Committee Meeting, each Member will review the proposals, make notes and score accordingly. Contracts and Procurement and the Agency Project Manager will score the pricing area of the proposals which will be a minimum of 30% of the scoring weight. 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 may write questions and highlight items that they wish to bring up at the Committee meeting on their copies of the proposals.**

Upon completing the evaluation of the submitted proposals, a point total will be calculated for each. The highest rated proposals may be scheduled for interviews. At the end of the interview phase, score sheets will be completed and final ranking of the firms.

Committee Members individually score the proposals following the guidelines below and rank them 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 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 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 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”.

V. REFERENCES

References are usually checked after the initial scoring is completed and an interview list has been determined. Questions asked should relate directly to the evaluation criteria and the same questions should be asked of all contacts.

VI. 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., suppliers/proposers, staff members, media, etc. Once an approval of award has been received from the Mayor or Designee, the proposals become a public record. Score sheets also become a public record once an approval of award has been received.

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.