

# Scoring Guidance for INDOT Professional Services RFPs

Updated: 09/01/2015



# Conflict of Interest

- **Does a Conflict of Interest Exist?**

Scorer's Agreement
<p>The primary purpose of scoring for this RFP is to identify the best firm for the scope of work advertised. It is the responsibility of INDOT scorers to make every effort to identify the firm most capable of producing the highest quality deliverables in a timely and cost effective manner without regard to personal preference. Historical performance data and references should be sought out and applied to the maximum extent necessary to make the best professional judgment possible.</p> <p>All information contained in Letters of Interest, scoring documents, and scoring tabulations, including the names of the scoring team, consultant ranking and shortlist information is to be considered confidential until such time as all associated contracts with an item are executed and the information is published for public viewing. Divulging details regarding the above confidential information will result in discipline and may result in dismissal.</p> <p>IC 4-2-6-9 prohibits state employees from participating in decision making in certain circumstances such as those in which the employee or a family member would have a potential financial interest in the outcome. Scorers shall abide by the ethical requirements set forth in IC 4-2-6-9.</p> <p>All scoring documents will be published to the Internet for public information upon execution, approval and awarding of the contracts. This scoring documentation will then become important information to the submitting consultants for obtaining feedback on their Letters of Interest regarding INDOT's evaluation of their qualifications, past performance and capabilities. The consultants will be relying on your scoring to focus their improvement activities.</p> <p>Accurate evaluation without regard to personal relationships is a must to obtain the improvement in performance desired by INDOT and the consultant.</p> <p>I have read this document prior to scoring the Letters of Interest for RFP 1506 and I understand the importance of using due diligence in determining scores for each Letter of Interest associated with the items that I will be scoring and I understand the confidential nature of the information and materials.</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I affirm the above Statement</p> <p>Affirmed by Heather McIntosh on 08/17/2015 09:01 AM</p>

- **If there is a conflict or possible appearance of a conflict of interest ask to be removed from the scoring team.**



# Scoring

- Information available to scorers
  - Performance evaluation detail link
  - Active and Pending Contract Balances (capacity)
  - Current and Completed Projects (capacity & references)

**Item Maintenance**

**Item Header**

Item ID: 2638      RFP Date: 06/09/2015      Item Process Status: Scoring Started  
 RFP #: 1506      Contract Type: On Call      Item Status: Active  
 Item #: 01      2 Step Scoring: No      BE Goals: DBE: 3%

Owner Office: Crawfordsville Dist / Production  
 Item Description: On Call - Environmental Services

[Back to Summary Page](#)

<b>Scorer</b>	Heather McIntosh	<b>Letters of Interest Submittals</b>	<b>Submitted Documents</b>
<b>Firm</b>	Lochmueller Group, Inc.		Letter of Interest (LOI)
<b>Past Performance</b>	<a href="#">Performance Evaluation</a>		Affirmative Action Certificate (AAC)
			Current and Completed Projects (CCP)
			Active and Pending Contract Balance Form (APB)
			List of Sub-contractors

**Upper Scoresheet**

Category		Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	<input type="checkbox"/> -3.00	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	20.00	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 0.00	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.00	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.		
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.		15.00	
	<input type="checkbox"/> -3.00	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 0.00	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.00	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for required services for value added benefit.		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.00	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources		



# Capacity

- Scorers need to be very careful to not evaluate capacity in a way that unnecessarily directs selections to the largest firms. This is not a rating of the size of firm, but an evaluation of the capacity of a firm to perform the work needed from a contract. Scorers not able to determine a substantive difference between firms using the below descriptions are encouraged to rate all firms the same as either "0" or "1".

Capacity of Team to do Work - Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform on time.		Score	Weight
			20
Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	Firms with expected capacity to deliver at a rate substantially faster than 1/4 of the contract amount per year should be scored at "1" unless there is concern that the firm has existing on-call contracts in the same district as the contract being considered and large unassigned contract balances.	1	
Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	Firms with expected capacity to deliver at a normal rate of 1/4 of the contract amount or more per year should be scored at "0" or "1". Firms with existing on-call contracts in the same district as the contract being considered and large unassigned contract balances and 2 or more years remaining may be rated as "0" instead of "1" if there is perceived benefit of additional capacity that would be attributable to having a contract with an additional firm instead of another with the same firm. A "0" or "-3" score could also be selected for a firm that is behind schedule on existing contract services.	0	
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	Considering the known current backlog of work and available personnel, firms not expected to have available capacity to deliver at a normal rate of 1/4 of the contract amount per year should be scored with -3. A "0" or "-3" score could also be selected for a firm that is behind schedule on existing contract services.	-3	

# Capacity *(continued)*

- **INDOT on-call contracts are typically four year contracts and the normal assumption is that the selected firm should be able to deliver an annual production rate of about 1/4 of the contract amount per year. Firms with capacity to deliver services at a rate substantially faster may be rated higher and firms we do not believe can deliver at the base expectation rate should be rated negatively.**
- **For reference, a typical full time individual should be expected to deliver at least \$200,000 of work per year. Most firms should be rated as "0" or "1".**



# Negative Scores

- Negative selection scoring ratings are sometimes appropriate, but should only be given after serious consideration.
- All selection scoring is published on the INDOT public website at: <https://pscsc.indot.in.gov/rfppublicwebsite/F01/S002.aspx>.



RFP Item #	Item Description	Supporting Documents	LOI	Scoresheets	SRC Tabulation
01	Road Project Development Services - SR 28 Road Rehabilitation in Clinton County	Supporting Documents	LOI	Scoresheets	SRC Tabulation
02	Project Development Services - SR 26 Road Rehabilitation in Clinton County	Supporting Documents	LOI	Scoresheets	SRC Tabulation
03	Bridge Project Development Services - US 41 Bridge Deck Overlay in Lake County	Supporting Documents	LOI	Scoresheets	SRC Tabulation
04	Bridge Project Development Services - Bridge Rehabilitation, Multi-Des	Supporting Documents	LOI	Scoresheets	SRC Tabulation
05	On Call - Bridge Rehabilitation Services	Supporting Documents	LOI	Scoresheets	SRC Tabulation

- Negative ratings are a significant concern to firms because all of the scoring information is available for public viewing and the scores are a public indication of INDOT's perception of a firm's ability to perform.
- Negative ratings should not be assigned due to technicality issues related to omissions from the LOI.
- When a scorer is compelled to assign a negative rating, the scorer must provide written justification to the assigned team leader for the item being scored so the justification is made available to the Selection Review Committee.

# Team Leaders

- **Team leaders are responsible for investigating and explaining any scoring anomalies to the SRC. Two scoring anomalies requiring further explanation in the comments field of the team lead tabulation are:**
  - **Negative scores among firms ranked for possible selection or alternate.**
  - **Negative scores and low ranks from one scorer for a firm that is highly ranked by the other scorers.**
- **If the team leader determines that anomalies are not justified, the team leader shall coordinate with the scorer and contract administration RFP administrator to allow reconsideration of score values.**



# Negative Scores *(continued)*

- Negative ratings only for specific firm deficiency.
- Negative ratings are not for technicality issues related to omissions from the LOI.
- Negative ratings require written justification to be provided to team leader and will be shared with the Selection Review Committee (SRC).
- The team leader shall document the justification comments in the team lead comment section for the SRC's review.



# Negative Scores *(continued)*

- The team leader shall document the justification comments in the team lead comment section for the Selection Review Committee's review.

Item Maintenance

**Item Header**

Item ID: 2739 RFP Date: 06/30/2015 Item Process Status: Commence Team Lead Evaluation  
RFP #: 1506s1 Contract Type: Other Item Status: Active  
Item #: 01 2 Step Scoring: Yes BE Goals: No BE Goals  
Owner Office: Central Office / Innovation & Enhance  
Item Description: Highway Lighting Energy Cost Savings Analysis and Implementation Program

**Team Lead Tabulation**

Scoring Step 1  Scoring Step 2

**Scoring Step 1**

Firm Name	Ranking	Rank Total	Total Score	Heather McIntosh 07/06/2015		Wei Shi 07/06/2015		Carolyn Richardson 07/07/2015	
				Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
[REDACTED]	1	3	165	0	1	110	1	55	1

The team lead is responsible for investigating and explaining any scoring anomalies to the Selection Review Committee. Two scoring anomalies that will require explanation are:

- Negative scores among firms ranked for possible selection or alternate.
- Negative scores and low ranks from one scorer for a firm that is highly ranked by the other scorers.

If the team lead determines that anomalies are not justified the team lead will need to coordinate with the Scorer and Contract Administration RFP Administrator to allow reconsideration of score values.

Comments

Characters left: 4000

I affirm that I have reviewed the scores for this item and have documented explanations of anomalies in the comment area above.



# Performance Evaluation Data

- Aggregate performance data averages are sometimes automatically applied to scoresheets from the PSCS application, however, this does not relieve selection scorers from the responsibility to review specific performance data when appropriate.
- A link to Performance evaluation report data is available within the PSCS Contract Administration scoring panel.

The screenshot displays the PSCS application interface for the Indiana Department of Transportation. The main window is titled "INDOT Performance Evaluation" and shows a "Details Report Parameters" section with fields for "Firm", "Start Date", "End Date", "Number of Evaluations to be considered", "Performance Type", and "Performance Type". A red arrow points to a link labeled "Performance Evaluation" in the "Past Performance" section of the "Scorer" panel. The "Upper Scoresheet" table is visible at the bottom, with columns for "Category", "Score", "Weight", and "Weighted Score".

Category	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Rating or predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.			

# Performance Evaluation Data *(Continued)*

- **Aggregate performance data applied directly on scoresheets is based on Performance Types pre-defined for each RFP item. Scorer assigned ratings should not be based upon the auto-calculated scores already applied, but instead should be based on qualification information in the Letters of Interest, relevant past experience with the firm and on performance data research related to individual project managers and significant subconsultants not incorporated in the aggregate scores.**
- **When reviewing reports look for negative scores within applicable performance types and look at score averages. Individual performance evaluations can be reviewed from the home search screen using Evaluation Id's from details reports.**



# Performance Evaluation Data *(Continued)*

- **Firm Report is default**
  - If a subconsultant is performing an important component their data can be reviewed
- **Project Manager Performance**
  - Reports ->Details Report ->Person Responsible for Deliverable-Firm



# Fair and Systematic Scoring Approach

- **The benefits of a fair and systematic scoring approach are:**
  - Industry confidence in INDOT's scoring process
  - Elimination of inconsistencies
  - Fewer concerns raised by firms and directed to the Selection Review Committee (SRC) members and Executive staff

