Adult Reentry Grant Rating Factors Discussion

Executive Steering Committee Meeting
November 14, 2019

BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS
BSCC CALIFORNIA

Requirements for Developing the Request for Proposal's (RFP) Rating Factors

I. Process Overview:

    A. Review evaluation goals and measurements

    B. Determine & define rating factors

    C. Determine if special selection criteria will be used

    D. Assigning rating factor weights

    E. Minimum Scoring Threshold

    F. Future ESC Meeting information

    G. Develop Rating Factors

BSCC CALIFORNIA

Goal of the Evaluation Process

I. I. Goal: Rank proposals according to merit by creating an evaluation process that is reliable, valid and fair. By way of:

> A. Selecting the best proposals.
>
> B. Using a process that is fair to all bidders.
>
> C. Using an accepted measurement principle.
>
> D. Using a process that will withstand appeals.

BSCC CALIFORNIA

Evaluation Process Measurements

II. Measurement: To ensure that the evaluation process is valid,

  A. Rating factors should be well defined.
  B. Rating factors should be weighted appropriately.
  C. Bidders should be given clear instructions via the RFP content.
  D. Rating factors should be relevant to the intent and goals of the grant.

Determining Rating Factors

The ESC is responsible for creating rating factors by which every proposal will be assessed and ranked.

I. Rating Factors must be:

    A. Appropriate for addressing the full worth of each proposal. What you want to know from the applicants is what you should ask.

    B. Mutually exclusive so that a characteristic is only measured once.

    C. Measurable so that raters can agree on the definition and objective assessment of a factor. The less gray area, the better.

Defining Rating Factors

I. Rating Factors are defined by criteria. These criteria provide detailed insight into each rating factor.

II. Example: The ESC identifies the "Program Need" as a rating factor. Accompanying criteria could include:

Program Need: *Narrative Instructions*

Criteria:

1. Identified target population (e.g., gender, age, offense history, criminogenic factors). Selection of the target population included, when appropriate:

   ♦ needs of underserved populations (e.g., disparities based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, immigration status).

   ♦ relationship of that population to the purpose of the grant.

2. Identified service gaps that contribute to the need.

3. Solicited community input in determining need.

4. Provided relevant qualitative and/or quantitative data with citations in support of the need.

Special Selection Criteria

I. The ESC (or Legislature) may determine that additional criteria need to be established for funding consideration.

- Preference points are assigned to special criteria in addition to those for rating factors.

II. Example: The ESC decides that preference points will be given to bidders who collaborate with 3 or more CBOs.

- Other options:

    a. Affected population

    b. Collaboration amongst stakeholders

    c. Adherence to guiding principles

    d. Amount of matching funds

Assigning Rating Factor Weights

The ESC is responsible for assigning weights to each rating factor by which every proposal will be assessed and ranked.

I. Relative Importance: The ESC will assign each rating factor a weight using a percentage system (out of 100%). Rating factor scores and an overall point total will be determined by this system.

II. Example: The ESC may determine that one rating factor is twice as important as another factor (e.g. Program Need and is twice as important as the Program Budget). Therefore, if the ESC assigned a percentage of 10% to the Program Budget, 20% would be assigned to the Program Need factor.

Assigning Rating Factor Weights

As a group, the ESC will assign percentage weights using the table below. Points are then automatically generated for each factor. If special selection criteria are used, preference points are included. The total possible points are summed to obtain the Maximum Possible Score.

♦ Scenario with assigned weights:

Rating Factor		Point Range	Percent of Total Value	Maximum Point Value	Weighted Score
1	Project Need	1-5	35%	35	70
2	Project Description	1-5	35%	35	70
3	Project Evaluation	1-5	25%	25	50
4	Budget Section	1-5	5%	5	10
	Total:		100%	100	200
Preference Points: If applicable.					
Maximum Possible Score with Preference Points:					200

BSCC
CALIFORNIA

Determining Total Possible Points for RFP

The ESC will use the following rating scale when scoring each rating factor. Maximum point values and weighted sores are calculated by the Research Unit.

I. Rating Scale: A 5-point scale (excellent, good, satisfactory, fair, poor) with language anchored to each point.

♦ The ESC will use this scale to reliable evaluate the quality of RFP responses.

♦ Each Rating factor will receive a score corresponding to one of these anchors.

Poor 1	Fair 2	Satisfactory 3	Good 4	Excellent 5
The response addresses the rating factor in a very inadequate way.	The response addresses the rating factor in a non-specific or unsatisfactory way.	The response addresses the rating factor in an adequate way.	The response addresses the rating factor in a substantial way.	The response addresses the rating factor in an outstanding way.

BSCC CALIFORNIA

Minimum Scoring Threshold

Once the ESC determines the rating factor weights, the group may also choose to impose a minimum scoring threshold.

I.   Threshold: A threshold is the minimum score that a proposal must earn to be considered for funding.

    A. Thresholds may be based on anything that has assigned points.

        i. Total possible points.
            Ex: Must receive at least 168 out of 250 total possible points, in order to be considered for funding.

        ii. Specific rating factor points.
            Ex: Must receive at least a 50% of the total possible points for the Program Description, in order to be considered for funding.

Future ESC Meetings

I. Rater Training

- ◆ Rating factor refresher
- ◆ Proposal evaluation goals
- ◆ Rating process, scale and rubric
- ◆ Rating errors to avoid
- ◆ Rating exercise: Using the rating scale and rubric

II. Scoring Discussion

- ◆ Review and discuss the ESC's rating factor scores
- ◆ Review total scores and proposal rankings
- ◆ Make funding recommendation for the Board

Developing ARG Rating Factors

1. Identify Rating Factors

2. Define Rating Factors with Criteria

3. Assign Weights/Points

4. Review Rating Scale