

RFP AWARD RECOMMENDATION MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the School Board of Palm Beach County
Date: November 5, 2012
Subject: Proposal Evaluation and Recommendation for RFP 13C-003K for Inspector General Hotline Services

Submitted herewith is the award recommendation for the above referenced Request for Proposal.

HISTORY

On August 25, 2012 a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Inspector General Hotline Services was solicited. The objective of the RFP was to contract with qualified and experienced firm(s) to provide, when needed, the implementation and maintenance of a confidential (to the extent permitted by law), secure, toll-free hotline reporting system that operates twenty-four (24) hours per day, seven (7) days per week, and 365 days a year. In addition, firm to establish a confidential (to the extent permitted by law), and anonymous integrated secure Web reporting system. Such "hot line" and Web reporting system must be available to any individuals or whistleblowers who wish (1) to report complaints/allegations of criminal, ethical, or policy violations; fraud; theft or embezzlement; and/or economic waste, mismanagement, or misuse of District property, funds, or resources; (2) to provide recommendations for cost savings initiatives; (3) to suggest improvements to make the District more efficient. Such reporting system should be user friendly, scalable, and accessible to employees and members of the public including those which are hearing impaired. The system must comply with applicable state and federal law, including confidentiality and privacy laws. The Proposals were opened on September 25, 2012.

The Proposals were evaluated by a team which included Michelle Andrewin, Director, Diversity in Business Practices; Kara Rubinson, General Manager, IT Solutions; Angel Garcia, Senior Projects Administrator-Major Capital Projects, Facilities Services; Vince Caracciolo, Human Resource Relationship Manager/Area 2, Office of Professional Standards; Noah Silver, Audit Committee Member. The following also attended the evaluation committee meeting as non-voting members, in an advisory capacity only: Lung Chiu, Inspector General, Inspector General's Office; Elizabeth McBride, Senior Counsel, Legal Services; Angelette Green, Major, School Police.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

After submitting a signed Conflict of Interest Certification Form, the evaluation committee members were provided copies of the four (4) proposals submitted and were asked to independently review the proposals and complete a preliminary scoring sheet using the following criteria:

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Points Available</u>
Experience and Qualifications of the Firm	30 Points
Qualifications of Proposer's Staff	20 Points
Approach/Methodology	40 Points
Minority/Women Business Participation	10 Points

RFP Award Recommendation Memorandum

- **Experience and Qualifications of the Firm:** This category dealt with the prior experience and capabilities of the respondent in providing the requested services to an institution such as the School District of Palm Beach County.
- **Qualifications of Proposer's Staff:** This category required the responders to provide the names of individuals who would be assigned to the contract, if awarded to the proposer. They were asked to expand on the experience level of these individuals and to provide resumes to include all pertinent experience.
- **Approach/Methodology:** This category required responders to provide how they would establish and monitor a Hotline and confidentially report all communications to the designated District staff member(s).

Responders were asked to provide five (5) references for work completed by their firm during the past five years that was within the scope of the services requested by the RFP. Staff from the Purchasing Department contacted the references submitted by the responders and a reference matrix was provided to the committee to assist them with evaluating and comparing reference information obtained.

Each criterion was given a score based on the following:

- Exceptional –full point value
- Exceeds standards – 85% of full point value
- Meets standards – 75% of full point value
- Fails to meet all standards – 25% of full point value
- Unacceptable – 0% of full point value

After independently scoring the proposals, the committee met to discuss their independent scores and the justification for those scores for each of the proposals. During the discussions, members heard the rationale of other committee members for their scoring decisions. Committee members were able to adjust their scoring at this time based on those discussions. If changes were made, committee members were asked to make notes on their evaluation sheets explaining their reasoning for awarding additional points or subtracting points for all vendors. The documents were collected at the end of the meeting and are included in the RFP file and subject to the Florida Sunshine Law.

The Office of Diversity in Business Practices representative identified that none of the four (4) proposers qualified for minority participation points based on the information provided in each proposal.

After the Evaluation Committee completed the scoring, excluding any consideration of Cost of Services, the points were totaled. Only proposals receiving a minimum acceptable score of 70% or better of the total possible points proceeded to the Cost of Services evaluation.

EVALUATING THE COST BY DETERMINING THE TOTAL COST PER POINT

A blended rate was calculated using the proposed cost submitted by each responder. The rate was divided by the total points scored per proposer.

The ranking of the proposals were based on the calculated lowest cost per point. The formula is $A/B = C$, where:

A = Cost submitted by proposer

B = Total points awarded to proposer

C = Cost per point

RECOMMENDATION

The Evaluation Committee recommends the District enter into negotiations with KJAS Inc., dba Ethical Advocate, the proposer offering the lowest cost per point based on the evaluation criteria outlines in the RFP.