

*CSA
PROPOSAL
EVALUATION
SYSTEM*

THE GOAL OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION IS TO
SELECT THE MOST MERITORIOUS PROPOSALS
USING A PROCESS THAT:

- Is fair to all bidders
- Uses accepted measurement principles
- Results in bidders feeling that they have been fairly treated
- Will withstand challenges

To produce valid and fair measurement of the merit of proposals, CSA has developed a process with 11 essential steps:

THE CSA APPROACH TO PROPOSAL
EVALUATION:

MEASUREMENT

*The systematic assignment
of numbers to objects
(proposals in this case)*

STEP 1:

SELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE (ESC)

- Representatives of local agencies and stakeholders
- Experienced in corrections
- Expert in areas related to the funding goals
- Representative of diverse viewpoints
- Member of the Board (one or more)
- Dedicated to a time-consuming process

STEP 2:

ESC DEVELOPMENT OF RATING FACTORS

AB 900

9 RATING FACTORS

4 FACTORS RATED BY THE ESC

3 COMPUTED FACTORS

2 PREFERENCE-POINT FACTORS

The California Corrections Standards Authority

AB 900 PROPOSAL EVALUATION FACTORS		
TYPE OF FACTOR	EVALUATION FACTOR	MAXIMUM POINTS
ESC RATING FACTORS	1. Project Need	250
	2. Detention Alternatives	100
	3. Scope of Work and Project Impact	100
	4. Administrative Work Plan	100
COMPUTED FACTORS	5. Net Gain in Beds	200
	6. Cost Effectiveness	150
	7. Cash Match	25
PREFERENCE POINTS	8. Reentry Facility	300
	9. Mental Health and Crisis Care Services	100
Grand Total		1,325

The California Corrections Standards Authority

4 ESC Rating Factors

Proposal Score = the mean of the 9 ESC ratings for that rating factor

3 Computed Factors

Proposal Score = a linear transformation of the computed score (e.g., % of match) converted to the rating-factor point-range (e.g., 25 points)

2 Preference Point Factors

Proposal Score = 0, 150 or 300 points were awarded depending on planned reentry facility siting, and 0, 50 or 100 points were awarded depending on proposed mental health and crisis care services

STEP 3:

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

- Establishes the rules for the competition
- Specifies the information bidders must provide
- Describes the evaluation process
- Defines the rating factors
- Lists the format requirements for the proposal
- Sets the timeline for the competition process
- Creates a level playing field for the competition

STEP 4:
TECHNICAL REVIEW

The technical review by CSA staff determines and documents that proposals have met the minimum requirements in the RFP for continuing in the competition.

STEP 5:

RATER TRAINING CONSISTS OF:

- Review of the definitions of the rating factors
- Description of the rating scales and rating techniques
- Explanation for the use of the Raters' Guide and the Calibration Form
- Discussion of rating errors and how to avoid them
- An exercise: practice in reading and rating proposals
- Rater rules: independent ratings, conflicts of interest

AB 900 JAIL PROPOSAL RATING FORM

Proposal Being Rated:			Proposal #:		
Rater:			Initial Rating Date:		
RATING FACTORS			INITIAL RATING	REVISE RATING	
1	Project Need:	<i>The extent to which the project is needed (based upon a clear, comprehensive and convincing need statement).</i>	(0 – 250)		
Conclusions of needs assessment are provided.		Average Daily Population is compared with system capacity.			
Information and statistical data supports needs assessment conclusions.		Expected future growth (up to 5 years) and accommodations made for expected growth are described.			
Security, safety or health needs (if any) are identified.		Proposal states the extent to which the ADP consists of long-term (routine) contract beds.			
Program and service needs (if any) are identified					
Litigation, court-ordered caps or consent decrees (if any) related to crowding or conditions of confinement are described.		Demographic/trend data are provided: e.g., county population, crime statistics, crowding, bed-need estimates, and detention facility population data (such as the CSA Jail Profile Survey information).			
Non-compliance findings or recommendations from state and local authorities are described.					
2	Detention Alternatives:	<i>The extent and appropriateness of the applicant's programming efforts to reduce recidivism.</i>	(0 – 100)		
Demonstrates that all appropriate steps to reduce crowding have been undertaken.		Programs to reduce reliance on confinement are described (e.g., how long in place, how successful).			
Applicants demonstrates programming efforts to reduce recidivism among local offenders (including evidence-based programs).		The types and effectiveness of current population management measures are described.			
Existing or new programs designed to reduce recidivism are described.					
Demonstrates efforts to implement a risk-based detention system (or other appropriate model) related to decisions to incarcerate or not incarcerate offenders.					
A history of actions taken to alleviate crowding is provided.					
3	Scope of Work and Project Impact:	<i>The extent to which the proposed scope of work is appropriate to, and will positively impact, the stated need.</i>	(0 – 100)		
Proposed scope of work (specifically payable from state funds, cash match and in-kind match) is described.		The extent to which the facility will be "green" is described.			
Proposal states whether project expands existing facility or creates a new one.					
Proposal states whether or not the county owns the site.					
Proposal states how the scope of work will meet identified needs, or mitigate/remedy/improve conditions.					
Pre-construction conditions are contrasted with expected post-construction conditions (i.e., the construction project impact).					
4	Administrative Work Plan:	<i>The extent to which the plan for designing, performing and management is conducive to project success.</i>	(0 – 100)		
The plan for designing, performing and managing the proposed project is likely to result in success.		Proposal describes how the county will demonstrate its readiness to proceed.			
Current stage of the planning process is described.		Proposal demonstrate the county's financial capacity and ability to staff the facility within 90 days of completion.			
The plan for the project design is described.					
The project timeline and milestones are provided.		The functions and responsibilities of project staff/contractors is described.			
The plan for project management (including key staff and names and titles) are provided.		The monitoring/control protocols that will ensure successful project completion are described.			
The plan for project administration (including key staff and names and titles) are provided.					
Proposal describes how the county will translate the proposal into a completed project.					
TOTAL POINTS					

RATER GUIDE

AB 900 JAIL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

RATING SCALE RANGES

	VERY LOW	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
THE NUMERICAL SCALES USED IN THE EVALUATION	Omitted From Proposal or Completely Unacceptable	Marginal Quality, Significant Problems or Omissions	Acceptable, Average, Some Problem Areas or Omissions	Very Good Quality, Definitely Above Average, Only Minor Issues or Omissions	Top Notch Quality, Excellent
250 POINT SCALE	0-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250
100 POINT SCALE	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100



ESC RATING CALIBRATION FORM

		PROJECT NEED	DETENTION ALTERNATIVES	SCOPE OF WORK; PROJECT IMPACT	ADMINISTRATIVE WORK PLAN
TOP NOTCH QUALITY	250		100		
	225		90		
	201		81		
VERY GOOD QUALITY	200		80		
	175		70		
	151		61		
ACCEPTABLE AVERAGE	150		60		
	125		50		
	101		41		
MARGINAL QUALITY	100		40		
	75		30		
	51		21		
UNACCEPTABLE	50		20		
	25		10		
	0		0		

STEP 6:

ESC READING AND RATING OF PROPOSALS

ESC members read all proposals (24) in a prescribed order. The ratings are made independently (no interaction among ESC members).

STEP 7:

BIDDER PRESENTATIONS, OPPORTUNITY FOR
ESC MEMBER REVISION OF RATINGS

*Based upon new information
relevant to the rating
factors, ESC members can
revise their initial ratings.*

STEP 8:

DATA ENTERED INTO
PROPOSAL EVALUATION SOFTWARE

*Computed values, preference
points and ESC ratings are
entered into two
computers by IT staff.*

STEP 9:

ESC REVIEW OF RATINGS

For the first time in the process, ESC members view all the ESC ratings. Areas of agreement and disagreement are open for discussion. Based upon these discussions, ESC members have the opportunity to review and revise their ratings for the final time.

The California Corrections Standards Authority

RATING RESULTS FOR DISCUSSION

PROJECT NEED (example, not actual data)

Points 250					RATERS								
Mean	RANK	RANGE	#	Counties	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5	Rater 6	Rater 7	Rater 8	Rater 9
147.2	12	75	1	Proposal 1	150	127	130	195	178	150	125	150	120
207.3	6	80	2	Proposal 2	198	210	240	245	165	207	195	230	175
219.6	2	60	3	Proposal 3	250	216	230	225	190	200	200	250	215
160.3	11	74	4	Proposal 4	199	194	150	145	125	180	150	145	155
183.3	9	78	5	Proposal 5	218	191	140	200	156	180	210	190	165
211.7	4	45	6	Proposal 6	227	217	208	230	228	195	185	200	215
167.3	10	98	7	Proposal 7	198	208	135	135	170	200	205	145	110
226.3	1	44	8	Proposal 8	240	217	226	245	212	240	201	225	230
218.1	3	95	9	Proposal 9	201	217	225	245	245	240	150	240	200
210.0	5	97	10	Proposal 10	244	189	147	235	200	240	210	240	185
185.4	8	90	11	Proposal 11	162	215	212	235	150	205	165	179	145
194.8	7	90	12	Proposal 12	190	218	150	195	170	210	195	240	185

STEP 10:

ESC REVIEW OF PROPOSAL RANKINGS
BASED UPON TOTAL SCORES

The ESC members view the proposal total scores for the first time. They view the proposal rankings and the proposals that would qualify for funding if the Board concurs with the ranking recommendations.

STEP 11:

ESC APPROVAL OF RANKINGS

The ESC decides whether to recommend the proposal ranking to the CSA Board.

QUESTIONS?

*CSA
PROPOSAL
EVALUATION
SYSTEM*