

SB 1022

Executive Steering Committee

Proposal Evaluation Rater Training



Proposal Evaluation Steps



STEPS IN THE PROPOSAL EVALUATION

- I. ESC convenes for Proposal Rater Training
- II. Proposals are distributed to ESC, Nov 6, 2013
- III. ESC members read and make preliminary ratings, Nov 7 – Dec 3, 2013
- IV. ESC convenes for county presentations, Dec 4 – 5, 2013
- V. ESC members discuss rater differences and may revise independent ratings
- VI. Proposal rankings are viewed and discussed



Evaluation Goals and Measurement



GOALS OF THE PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

- Select the most meritorious proposals
- Use a process that is fair to all bidders
- Use accepted measurement principles
- All bidders feel they have been treated fairly
- Use a process that will withstand challenges



MEASUREMENT

- Rating factors are well defined
- Rating factors are weighted appropriately
- Bidders are given clear instructions
- What is measured is relevant/valid
- Measurement process is fair
- Ratings are reliable (rater consistency over time)



RATER RELIABILITY

- I. Pay Attention to the RFP and Rating Factors
- II. Pay Attention to Your Criteria for What Constitutes a Good, Medium and Poor Response
 - Maintain the same standards for all the proposals.
 - If your standards do evolve, go back and change your ratings
- III. Pay Attention to Your Use of the Rating Scale
 - Use as much of the rating range as possible.



The Rating Process & Rating Forms



RATING PROCESS

- Review the RFP
- Review the rating factor definitions
- Review the rating sub-factors
- Use the same frame of reference
- Periodically, check the distribution of ratings
- Use as much of rating range as possible
- Be as consistent as possible



RATING FACTORS FORM

CONSTRUCTION OF ADULT LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES: RATING FORM					
APPLICANT					
RATING FACTORS				MAXIMUM	RATING
1.0	Project Need			250	
Bed Construction - If Applicable					
B:1.01	Describe the findings of the needs assessment completed by the county.	B:1.05	Discuss the current approach to reducing the need for beds, including programs and alternatives to incarceration.		
B:1.02	Provide a county jail system overview (e.g.; capacity, ADP and other relevant factors), including a description of other current or planned construction. If the county has an AB 900 awards(s), indicate such and identify the number of beds to be constructed and current stage of planning or construction for this project(s).	B:1.06	Provide data showing the effectiveness/impacts of these alternatives.		
B:1.03	Describe the system issues anticipated to be remedied by the new construction, such as: overcrowding, medical, or mental health beds.	B:1.07	Describe any plans underway, or future plans, to implement alternatives to incarceration and their anticipated results.		
B:1.04	Describe the current trends in the number of arrests, booking, releases due to lack of space and other relevant factors as they relate to the need for beds.				
Program Space Construction					
PS:1.01	Describe the current approach to offender programming (i.e., use of current program space, types of programs, and services) for custody and non-custody offenders.	PS:1.05	Describe the approach taken to determining the kind of programming that will take place in the new program space.		
PS:1.02	Describe what least restrictive alternatives have been put in place to address the needs of the population intended to be served by this proposal.	PS:1.06	Provide information and data supporting the county's need for program space.		
PS:1.03	Describe what least restrictive alternatives have been put in place to address the needs of the population intended to be served by this proposal.	PS:1.07	Indicate the approach to alternatives to incarceration and how the program will assist in managing the jail population.		
PS:1.04	Describe the gaps and deficiencies in current programming for custody and non-custody offenders, and which of these gaps or deficiencies will be addressed with proposed program space construction funding.	PS:1.08	Describe the need for programming that could assist with the jail population management.		
2.0	Scope of Work			200	
All Projects					
A:2.01	Detail the full scope of work that is the subject of this proposal, including a comprehensive description of the number and types of beds (if any), program spaces, and other core and ancillary spaces; indicate whether this is new stand-alone construction, an addition to an existing facility, or space that is being remodeled or renovated.				
Bed Construction - If Applicable					
B:2.01	Describe the planning process that resulted in this bed construction scope of work.	B:2.03	Describe the anticipated beneficial outcomes of the new bed construction.		
B:2.02	Describe the relationship between stated needs and the planned construction.	B:2.04	Define the staffing that will be required to operate the new construction.		
Program Space Construction					
PS:2.01	Describe the planning process used to develop the design for the construction of program space.	PS:2.04	Describe plans to implement and operate programs in the space.		
PS:2.02	Describe the relationship between stated needs and the proposed program space	PS:2.05	Describe the anticipated beneficial outcomes of the new program space construction.		
PS:2.03	Define the features of this program space construction that make it suitable for the intended programming.				




RATING FACTORS FORM

CONSTRUCTION OF ADULT LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES: RATING FORM				Page 2
APPLICANT				
RATING FACTORS			MAXIMUM	RATING
3.0	Offender Management and Programming		250	
Bed Construction - If Applicable				
B:3.01	Describe how the proposed construction will address the county's offender management goals regarding use of secure detention.	B:3.04	Describe the county's planned construction in relation to the expected need for beds in the future.	
B:3.02	Describe how the proposed bed construction aligns with the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) plan.			
B:3.03	Describe the use of, or plans to use, offender assessment(s) and other interventions to address jail population management, including objective tools or instruments to manage the offender population, such as pretrial assessments, etc.			
Program Space Construction				
PS:3.01	Describe how this program space construction will address the county's offender management goals.	PS:3.06	Describe the sources of financial support (i.e., Medi-Cal, other federal sources, etc.) that will be addressed to aid in the delivery of programs.	
PS:3.02	Describe how the program space construction aligns with the CCP plan.	PS:3.07	Describe the offender assessment(s) and the process for determining the programming offenders (custody and non-custody) will receive.	
PS:3.03	Describe the programming to be conducted in the new program space.	PS:3.08	Describe the approach to the principles and objectives of evidence-based programming that will be incorporated to reduce recidivism, including program evaluation.	
PS:3.04	Describe how the program space will foster a quality reentry model and seamless reentry process.	PS:3.09	Define the staff qualifications necessary to present the planned programming (e.g., staff training certification).	
PS:3.05	Describe collaborative partnerships that will provide services within the program space and provide continuity through the reentry and community supervision process.	PS:3.10	Describe the target population and estimated numbers of individuals to be served daily and annually in the program space. Describe how you arrived at those estimates.	
4.0	Administrative Work Plan		100	
4.01	Describe the plan for project management and administration, including key positions and responsibilities.	4.03	Describe the country's readiness to proceed with the project.	
4.02	Describe the current state of the county's project planning process.	4.04	Describe the construction project timeline.	
5.0	Budget Review		200	
5.01	Justify the amount of state financing requested for the planned construction.	5.04	Describe efforts to leverage other sources of funds (e.g., federal) for program delivery.	
5.02	Describe the anticipated benefits/impact of the construction in relation to construction costs (including any fiscal benefits).	5.05	Detail the cost effectiveness of this construction project, including from a population management perspective.	
5.03	Describe steps that the county has taken to minimize costs of this project.			



RATER GUIDE

CONSTRUCTION OF ADULT LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES					
RATER GUIDE: 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
200 POINT SCALE	0 - 40	41 -80	81 - 120	121 - 160	161 - 200
100 POINT SCALE	0 - 20	21 -40	41 - 60	61 - 80	81 - 100



Form 02 - Rater Guide



CALIBRATION FORM

CONSTRUCTION OF ADULT LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES: CALIBRATION FORM															
RATING FACTORS	UNACCEPTABLE			MARGINAL QUALITY			ACCEPTABLE AVERAGE			VERY GOOD QUALITY			TOP NOTCH QUALITY		
	0	25	50	51	75	100	101	125	150	151	175	200	201	225	250
1 Project Need	0	25	50	51	75	100	101	125	150	151	175	200	201	225	250
	B-Prop			C-Prop			D-Prop			E-Prop			F-Prop		A-Prop
2 Scope of Work	0	20	40	41	60	80	81	100	120	121	140	160	161	180	200
	B-Prop			C-Prop			D-Prop			E-Prop			F-Prop		A-Prop
3 Offender Management and Programming	0	25	50	51	75	100	101	125	150	151	175	200	201	225	250
	E-Prop			D-Prop			B-Prop			A-Prop			F-Prop		C-Prop
4 Administrative Work Plan	0	10	20	21	30	40	41	50	60	61	70	80	81	90	100
	B-Prop			C-Prop			D-Prop			A-Prop			E-Prop		F-Prop
5 Budget Review	0	20	40	41	60	80	81	100	120	121	140	160	161	180	200
	F-Prop			D-Prop			B-Prop			A-Prop			E-Prop		C-Prop

Form 03 - Calibration Form



FINAL RATING FORM

CONSTRUCTION OF ADULT LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES: Final Rating Form				
Proposal Being Rated:		Proposal #:		
Rater ID:		Initial Rating Date:		
RATING FACTORS		Rating Points	Initial Rating	Revised Rating
1	Project Need	0-250		
2	Scope of Work	0-200		
3	Offender Management and Programming	0-250		
4	Administrative Work Plan	0-100		
5	Budget Review	0-200		

Form 05 - Final Rating Form



Potential Rating Errors



POTENTIAL RATING ERRORS

- I. Halo
- II. Restriction of Range
- III. Leniency, Strictness, Central Tendency
- IV. Triage
- V. Moving Frame of Reference
- VI. Fatigue
- VII. Pre-Judgments, Prejudices, or Extraneous Information



RATING SCALE USE AND RATING ERROR EXAMPLES

CONSTRUCTION OF ADULT LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES: CALIBRATION FORM																			
RATING FACTORS		UNACCEPTABLE			MARGINAL QUALITY			ACCEPTABLE AVERAGE			VERY GOOD QUALITY		TOP NOTCH QUALITY						
		0	25	50	51	75	100	101	125	150	151	175	200	201	225	250			
1	Project Need	Using most of the scale																	
		B-Prop			C-Prop			D-Prop			E-Prop			F-Prop			A-Prop		
2	Scope of Work	Good range, but in the same order as 1 (Halo)																	
		B-Prop			C-Prop			D-Prop			E-Prop			F-Prop			A-Prop		
		Even better																	
3	Offender Management and Programming	Grouped Leniency																	
		Grouped, Central Tendency																	
		Grouped, Strictness																	
		Grouped, Central Tendency																	
4	Administrative Work Plan	Halo-Prejudgment-Extraneous, Grouped, Strictness																	
		Triage																	
		Triage																	
5	Budget Review	Moving frame of reference, fatigue																	
		Moving frame of reference, fatigue																	

Form 06 - Rating Error Examples



POTENTIAL RATING ERRORS

1. Halo

- The error occurs when a rater decides, without paying attention to the individual Rating Factors, that the overall quality is at a specific level (high, medium or low).
- To avoid the Halo error, pay close attention to each Rating Factor and sub-factor. Rate the response related to each factor and sub-factor on its own merits.



POTENTIAL RATING ERRORS

2. Restriction of Range

- The error occurs when all the scores across proposals are grouped in tight clusters.
- Tight grouping should only occur if there is little difference in the relative merits among proposals.
- To avoid this error, spread the scores out as much as possible. Use as much of the scale as possible.



POTENTIAL RATING ERRORS

3. Leniency, Strictness, Central Tendency

- The error is related to the restriction of range. Some raters fall into a pattern of not wanting to give low scores, or really high scores, or prefer to play it safe and give scores “in the middle”. As a result, the scores get grouped in a fairly tight cluster and little distinction is made among the proposals.
- To avoid this error, use the Calibration Form to identify whether this error is occurring.



POTENTIAL RATING ERRORS

4. Triage

- This occurs when a rater uses only parts of the rating scale. In the extreme, a rater might decide to use only three or two numbers on the rating scale.
- To avoid this error, make distinctions in your ratings that are as fine as possible. Ignoring real distinctions among proposals is bad measurement and is not fair to the applicants.
- Using the Calibration Form will help to identify whether this error is occurring.



POTENTIAL RATING ERRORS

5. Moving Frame of Reference

- This error occurs when raters fail to maintain a consistent, reliable approach to the ratings in terms of the Rating Process.
- To avoid moving frame of reference errors, as you read the proposals, periodically:
 - Review the definitions of the Rating Factors, sub-factors and weights.
 - Make sure that your understanding and interpretation of the Rating Factors hasn't changed over time.



POTENTIAL RATING ERRORS

6. Fatigue

- This occurs when the last few ratings are based on less attentiveness than earlier ratings.
- To avoid this error, take breaks.
- The rating process requires a high degree of concentration to wade through material that can be of mixed quality in terms of organization, clarity, relevance and adherence to the requirements of the RFP. Nevertheless, fairness to all applicants demands that a consistent degree of attention be paid to all proposals.



POTENTIAL RATING ERRORS

7. Prejudgments and Extraneous Information

- This error occurs when a rater rates a proposal based on his/her opinions about the applicant's county and or department.
- To avoid this error, be aware of the extent to which knowledge and judgments about an applicant or the applicant's department might inadvertently affect the proposal ratings (either positively or negatively).
 - If such prejudices exist, the rater should determine whether he/she can make a fair proposal evaluation and ignore the extraneous information.
 - If not, the rater should recuse him/herself from the rating of the proposal in question. If this is an issue, when you become aware of it please inform BSCC staff.



Final Comments

- I. To make merit-based awards, we need proposals to be ordered according to merit throughout the rating scale so that we can choose the best proposals especially at the point of the ranking where the money runs out – the cutoff point. We want to avoid ties at the cutoff point.
- II. Review the RFP, Rating Factors, Sub Factors, and Weights
- III. Make ratings independently following the Rating Rules
- IV. Stay vigilant regarding rating errors
- VI. Use as much of the Rating Scales as possible



Final Comments

- V. Raters have to be present throughout the whole process in order to count their scores
- VI. No rater names or personal notes on the Final Rating Form given to BSCC
- VII. Please make sure your ratings are legible



Exercise and Discussion

