



Recommendation to Award Contract in Response to  
Request for Proposals for an Evaluation of the  
Community Planning Process and to Authorize  
Executive Director to Enter into the Contract

January 10, 2013 Teleconference

## Issue

- ▣ Request for Proposals (RFP) issued to begin a competitive process to select a contractor for the MHSOAC's Community Planning Process (CPP) Evaluation
- ▣ Scoring process is now complete
- ▣ MHSOAC needs to consider approving the Intent-to-Award for the CPP Evaluation contract

## **Presentation Outline**

- ▣ MHSOAC commitment to evaluation
- ▣ Overview of CPP Evaluation
- ▣ Overview of contract selection process
- ▣ Bidder protest process
- ▣ Proposed motion
- ▣ Next steps

## **MHSOAC Commitment to Evaluation**

**There is a statutory role for MHSOAC to evaluate California's community-based mental health system**

[W&I Code 5845(a) and 5845(d)(12)]

- ▣ "The MHSOAC is committed to an approach of continuous evaluation, learning from and building upon each progressive completed evaluation. The approach will be focused on quality improvement."
  - ▣ MHSOAC adopted Policy Paper, *Accountability through Evaluative Efforts*

## Overview of CPP Evaluation: Objectives

- ▣ **Objective:** Use participatory research to evaluate the impact of the CPP
  - The goals of the MHSA rely upon high levels of community involvement and planning
  - The statute and regulations require ongoing community and stakeholder participation
  - A CPP process must be in place in each county that aims to continuously engage the community and ensure that all community members/groups have an opportunity to participate in MHSA efforts and provide feedback on MHSA decisions
- ▣ The primary goal of this project is to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the CPP process for quality improvement purposes

## Overview of CPP Evaluation: Use of Participatory Research

- ▣ Based on the MHSA's commitment to involving stakeholders, this evaluation will be carried out using participatory research
- ▣ Evaluators will be required to collaborate with a selected group of stakeholders (funded via the Client Stakeholder Contract)

## **Overview of CPP Evaluation: Scope of Work**

- ▣ Design research intended to identify characteristics of currently used CPP processes and efficacy of those processes
- ▣ Train Client Contractors to conduct data collection; provide guidance as needed
- ▣ Guide development of CPP process inventory
- ▣ Assess other public CPP processes
- ▣ Evaluate the efficacy of CPP processes and impact of those processes on MHPA outcomes
- ▣ Identify promising CPP processes and practices
- ▣ Consult with Client Contractors as they develop a curriculum and training/technical assistance for clients engaged in the CPP process

## **Overview of CPP Evaluation: Deliverables**

1. Report of Research Design and Data Collection Training Plan
2. Data Analytic Plan
3. Summary of Consultation Provided to Client Contractors regarding Inventory
4. Report of Other Public CPP Processes
5. Summary Report of Results from Data Analysis / Evaluation
6. Final Report of Promising CPP Process Practices
7. Summary of Consultation Provided to Client Contractors re: Curriculum and Training

## Overview of Contract Selection Process

- ▣ RFP announced on October 31, 2012
- ▣ Proposals received December 14, 2012
- ▣ Scoring process consistent with California Department of General Services procedures and regulatory requirements completed

## Overview of Contract Selection Process: Scoring

- ▣ **Stage 1: Submission Review – Administrative Review of Proposal Format**
  - Pass/Fail
- ▣ **Stage 2: Review of Proposer’s Experience/Qualifications and Project Narrative/Work Plan**
  - An overall maximum of 124 possible points may be achieved in this stage (up to 44 for the Experience/Qualifications and 80 for the Project Narrative/Work Plan)
  - A minimum of 87 points must be achieved to move on to Stage 3
- ▣ **Stage 3: Evaluation of Cost Proposal**
  - A maximum of 25 points is awarded to the cost proposal with the lowest total cost
  - All other scores are based on a ratio from the lowest cost proposal (lowest bid / total bid x 25)
  - Proposals with costs associated with deliverables that exceed the allowed percentage for any one deliverable receive an automatic score of zero (0)
- ▣ **Stage 4: Combining Proposer’s Scores from Stage 2 (Experience/Qualifications and Narrative/Work Plan) with Scores from Stage 3 (Cost Proposal)**
  - An overall maximum of 149 points may be achieved in this stage (124 for the Experience/Qualifications and Narrative/Work Plan and 25 points for the Cost Proposal)
- ▣ **Stage 5: Adjustments to Score Calculations for Bidding Preferences**

## **Bidder Protest Process**

- ▣ Bidders not selected through the scoring process may protest the award if they can prove:
  - The protesting proposer would have been awarded the contract had the MHSOAC correctly applied the prescribed rating standards in the RFP; or
  - The protesting proposer would have been awarded the contract had the MHSOAC followed the scoring methods in the RFP.

## **Proposed Motion**

1. Authorize the Executive Director to issue a "Notice of Intent to Award Contract" to the proposer receiving the highest overall score.
2. Establish January 17, 2013 as the deadline for unsuccessful bidders to file an "Intent to Protest" consistent with the five working day standard set forth in the Request for Proposals.
3. Direct the Executive Director to notify the Commission Chair and Vice Chair of any protests within two working days of the filing and adjudicate protests consistent with the procedure provided in the Request for Proposals.
4. Authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract upon expiration of the protest period or consideration of protests, whichever comes first.

## Next Steps

- ▣ Notice of Intent-to-Award posted
- ▣ Protest period ends in 10 working days
  - If applicable, Executive Director makes decision about protests
- ▣ Negotiate and implement contract with selected bidder
- ▣ Bidder begins work once contract is in place