



Champaign County Board Request for Proposal (RFP 2014-001) Evaluation Committee

MINUTES – APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED 4/7/14

Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2014
Time: 11:00 a.m.
Place: Jennifer Putnam Meeting Room
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington St.
Urbana, Illinois

Committee Members: Cathy Emanuel (Chair), Josh Hartke, Gary Maxwell, Rachel Schwartz, Debra Busey
Absent: Jeff Kibler
Others: Al Kurtz & Pattsy Petrie (Champaign County Board), Van Anderson (Champaign County Deputy Administrator of Finance), Beth Brunk (recording_secretary)

Call to Order

Chair Emanuel called the meeting to order at 11:08 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to approve the January 9, 2014 Champaign County Board RFP 2014-001 Evaluation Committee meeting minutes as distributed; seconded by Ms. Schwartz. Upon vote, the **MOTION carried unanimously**.

Approval of Agenda

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to approve the agenda as distributed; seconded by Mr. Maxwell. Upon vote, the **MOTION carried unanimously**.

Public Participation

Ms. Petrie suggested using a rating scale from 1-7 to score the respondents and use decimals rather than whole numbers for the weighting scale to allow for more gradations in the evaluation process. She also supported splitting Phase II in to two sections for different weighting.

Discussion of the Evaluation Criteria for RFP 2014-001 – Nursing Home Management Services for Champaign County, IL

Phase I summarized each of the nine submittal requirements in the RFP. With this form, the Committee will decide if the responder was responsive or non-responsive based on whether they provided what was asked for in the RFP. This tool will be used to support the conclusions of Phase II but may or may not be used in the final evaluation. Some subjectivity is entailed as the evaluators will have different levels of tolerance to determine what constitutes responsiveness. Ms. Busey commented that the Phase I document is a great tool for the first read of the responder's proposal to make sure you have everything that you are looking for in the RFP.

In Phase II, the proposals are evaluated numerically with each criterion weighted. All evaluation criteria must be completed for the combined scores to be meaningful. Once the evaluations have been submitted, this Committee will meet again to discuss the results. The scores will be compiled with overall averages for each company and individually for each category. Ms. Schwartz was concerned that Phase II was not detailed enough. Mr. Anderson explained that the criteria must be stated in the RFP to be included on the evaluation sheet and be general enough to not limit the range of responses. Mr. Anderson stated that an important question to be addressed by the respondent is to use their competence, expertise and past experiences to describe what they would do different to improve the County's nursing home. The Committee cannot anticipate what those ideas will be to put into a rating scheme.

In Phase II, Ms. Schwartz wondered if *Legal Actions, Financial Stability, Compliance with Laws and Conflict of Interest* should have a separate weighting scheme from the other categories to protect the County from a vendor who had a significant conflict of interest but a high score in the other categories. Ms. Busey found that idea problematic in how to reconcile the composite numbers from each grouping. As a compromise, Ms. Schwartz proposed including a clause at the top of each evaluation sheet that stated that the evaluation form is a tool and if there is a large concern with a responder, and then the County could reject the proposal. The Committee directed Mr. Anderson to place a statement at the top of Phase I and Phase II that it is a preliminary tool for evaluation and to use the language already in the RFP that reiterates the County's ability to reject any or all proposals based on the findings of either Phase I or Phase II.

Ms. Schwartz suggested that the *Past and Current Performance* should be weighted as a 5 instead of a 4 due to its importance. Since the cost is something that will be negotiated in the contract phase, the *Schedule of Professional Fees and Expenses* weighting was changed from a 4 to a 3. The Committee agreed.

Concerning the rating scale, Ms. Schwarz suggested 0 – 4 instead of 1 – 5 so if a respondent did not provide anything in a category; it could be rated at 0. That will result in a zero score for that criterion. The Committee agreed with this change. Ms. Emanuel felt that a larger rating scale was unnecessary as the Committee is not dealing with the precision needed for greater gradations.

Mr. Kurtz had a concern that some evaluators will have pre-conceived notions about the current management of the nursing home. Mr. Anderson pointed out that a requirement of the RFP is to have the respondents list a minimum of three references. By talking to other clients of all respondents, the Committee will be able to have other client viewpoints from which to examine the respondents. Ms. Emanuel commented that the current manager will be evaluated with both the positives and negatives from our knowledge and the knowledge that the Committee does not have as much information about the other applicants. At the next meeting, the Committee will determine what questions to ask all the references.

At the Pre-Proposal meeting on February 7th, staff will meet with the potential respondents. Next, the Committee will receive the responses and independently rate the proposals. A meeting will be scheduled to discuss the compiled results and the award process. The Committee will then recommend the respondents who will make a presentation to the County Board and will develop an evaluation tool for rating those respondents.

Other Business

None

Adjournment

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Maxwell. Upon vote, the **MOTION carried unanimously.**

Ms. Emanuel adjourned the meeting at 12:27 p.m.