

Appendix B: Scoring and Evaluation

A. Evaluation:

Each timely proposal determined to meet all minimum requirements will be evaluated by three (3) Reviewers. If one Reviewer determines he/she has a conflict of interest with a Respondent, that proposal will be reviewed by an alternate reviewer. If two Reviewers (which may include the alternate reviewer) determine they have conflicts with a Respondent, that Proposal will be disqualified. **The total score for each Proposal will be determined by summing the individual scores submitted by each Reviewer.**

In the event of a tie score, both Respondents will have an equal rank. If Respondents have tie scores in first place, ELC will follow the guidelines outlined in the RFP in **Section IX. F. (Tied Offers/Bids)**.

B. Scoring Rubric

All proposals will be evaluated by three (3) reviewers using the same criteria and eligible points for each section as noted below in the following table (Scoring Rubric)..

Respondent #: Evaluation Criteria	Respondent Response Criteria	Evaluator #:	
		Eligible Points	Evaluator Assigned Points
Fatal Errors:			
Proposal Due Date/Time	Respondent submits application after the posted due date <u>and</u> time per the date and timestamp applied via the JotForm application template.	0	N/A
Cone of Silence	Respondent violates the Cone of Silence by attempting to call or personally contact any of the parties identified in Section VIII A.	N/A	N/A
Proposal Evaluation:			
Vendor Organization, Size, and Structure (Section II)	Respondent completes the CMBE table and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checks Yes as a CMBE • Checks Yes in at least one of the other Designations • Provides MFMP documentation showing they have registered as a Vendor • Provides SunBiz.org documentation • Completes the Vendor Business Information Table (including revenues) • Reports at least five (5) years' experience working with Organizations Similar to ELC (See 'Vendor's Total Number of Years Working With' table • Describes Vendor's business organization, size and structure and how it supports their work providing Information Technology, Network Administration, and Technical 	0 – 5	

Appendix B: Scoring and Evaluation

Respondent #: Evaluation Criteria	Respondent Response Criteria	Evaluator #:	
		Eligible Points	Evaluator Assigned Points
	<p>Support Services to organizations similar to ELC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has no conflict of interest with an ELC Board Member or Employee. 		
<p>Current Professional Associations and Awards/Recognitions (Section III)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondent describes current professional associations and any awards/recognitions. Proposal includes a page for Section III even if response is N/A. • Proposals that list 'N/A' cannot receive more than one (1) point. 	0 – 5	
<p>Vendor's Experience and Qualifications of Key Staff Who Will Provide Services Outlined in the SOW, Appendix B (Section IV)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondent has at least five (5) years' experience providing Information Technology, Network Administration, and Technical Support Services included in the check-box selections. • Identifies and describes Project Lead with job title, degrees/certifications, years of experience managing projects that involve on-site and remote network administration, data security, training, and recovery, network disaster management, and on-site and remote technical support services and primary responsibilities. • Describes Respondent's capacity (types of positions and experience) which qualify them to provide services described in SOW. Proposal includes one-page summaries for each individual that will provide any of the services outlined in the SOW. 	0 – 25	
<p>Experience with Different Types of Organizations (Section V)</p>	<p>Respondent describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The types of information technology services Vendor has provided for government, not-for-profit, early learning coalitions or similar coalitions; • Methodology used to administer their networks, PBX, and ensure data security; Types of technical support provided; number of users supported; • Includes the names of three different types of organizations Vendor 	0 – 15	

Appendix B: Scoring and Evaluation

Respondent #: Evaluation Criteria	Respondent Response Criteria	Evaluator #:	
		Eligible Points	Evaluator Assigned Points
	contracted during the most recent five years.		
Written References (Section V)	<p>Proposal includes three (3) references with all required information and show Vendor worked with organizations similar to ELC, completed work similar to the tasks outlined in ELC's SOW, and completed all services in a satisfactory manner.</p> <p>Reduce rating if Respondent does not provide three (3) written/signed references.</p> <p>Reduce rating if written references do not clearly describe the services provided and describe their satisfaction with the completed work.</p> <p>Respondent may provide references from current clients.</p>	0 – 10	
Proof of Past Performance (Section VI)	<p>Respondent demonstrate Vendor's success in satisfactorily completing the project objectives for three clients. Projects must include the business or organization names and dates you provided contracted services.</p> <p>Reduce scoring if Respondent does not provide three clear examples of their performance.</p> <p>Reduce scoring if Respondent does not clearly demonstrate how the Vendor successfully completed the project.</p>	0 – 20	
Maximum Monthly Budget Estimate for Each Term (Section VII)	<p>Respondent's inserts and completes Tables A and B in Section VII.</p> <p>Respondent includes the estimated hours provided for different positions in their budget tables.</p> <p>Fixed Monthly Budget for initial and renewal terms are reasonable. for the services required in the SOW.</p>	0 – 10	
Value Added Services (Section VIII)	<p>Respondent clearly describes what distinguishes Vendor from others that provide Information Technology, Network Administration and Technical Support Services to organizations similar to ELC.</p> <p>Identifies all value-added services that will benefit ELC.</p>	0 – 5	

Appendix B: Scoring and Evaluation

Respondent #: Evaluation Criteria	Respondent Response Criteria	Evaluator #:	
		Eligible Points	Evaluator Assigned Points
Implementation Plan (Section IX)	Proposal describes the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology to review all components of ELC’s current network; • Plan to provide technical support for all computing equipment in all offices and for employees working remotely; • Describes of technical support staffing available during ELC’s business hour • Process for logging/tracking customer requests for technical assistance, wait times in queues, and process for monitoring call center and/or on-line request portal to ensure high quality support with minimum wait times; • Types of technical support provided on-site for users and network equipment; • Respondent’s approach for emergency response, mitigation, planning, and recovery. 	0 – 5	
Evaluation Panel Presentations and Scoring <i>(Not part of written proposal)</i> (Section X)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation follows the question outline e-mailed to all Respondents whose Proposals meet the minimum requirements. • Respondent adheres to time limits • Presentation conveys Respondent’s capacity to deliver all elements of the SOW effectively and on a timely basis. 	0 – 10	
Total Points		0 – 110	

Appendix B: Scoring and Evaluation