

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC – RFP ECIDS

Score Sheet  
 ECIDS Development RFP – NDERFP2111  
 Nebraska Department of Education

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>Reviewer:</b>                              | <b>Bidder:</b>            |
| <b>Date of Review:</b>                        |                           |
| <b>Meets Mandatory Requirements (Yes/No):</b> | <b>Final TOTAL Score:</b> |

| Area   | Possible Points | Weighting | Weighted Points  |
|--|-----------------|-----------|------------------|
| Part 1: Executive Summary                              | 5               | (5)       | <b>25</b>        |
| Part 2: Corporate Overview                             | 5               | (10)      | <b>50</b>        |
| Part 3: Technical Approach                             |                 |           | <b>300</b>       |
| 3.a. Bidders Understanding of the Project Requirements | 5               | (5)       | 25               |
| 3.b. Detailed Description of Proposed Solution         | 5               | (10)      | 50               |
| 3.c. Requirements Matrix                               | 5               | (25)      | 125              |
| 3.d. Project Planning and Management                   | 5               | (10)      | 50               |
| 3.e. Scope of Work and Deliverables                    | 5               | (10)      | 50               |
| Part 4: Cost Proposal                                  | 5               | (20)      | <b>100</b>       |
| Part 5: Overall  | 5               | (5)       | <b>25</b>        |
| <b>Total Possible Points</b>                           |                 |           | <b>500 Total</b> |

Reviewers are asked to evaluate each element of the proposal narrative as listed in the evaluation form and score each question on a scale of **0 - 5** as illustrated on the rating guidelines table below.

**Rating Guidelines:**

| Quality Indicator                            | Description   |
|--|---|
| <b>Exceeding expectations<br/>5</b>          | The response is specific and comprehensive. There is complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. The ideas presented are innovative, well-conceived and thoroughly developed.   |
| <b>Highly meeting expectations<br/>4</b>     | The response is reasonably comprehensive and includes sufficient detail. It contains many of the characteristics of a response that is very good even though it may require additional specificity, support or elaboration in places.   |
| <b>Moderately meeting expectations<br/>3</b> | The response is non-specific and lacks focus and detail. The response addresses some of the selection criteria, but not all. Some ideas presented are sound, but others are not responsive to the purpose of the RFP. Additional information is needed in order to be reasonably comprehensive and meet the criteria of a response that is good.  |
| <b>Somewhat meeting expectations<br/>2</b>   | The response does not meet many criteria; provides inaccurate information or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; lacks meaningful detail; demonstrates lack of preparation; or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the applicant’s understanding of the issue in concept and/or ability to meet the requirement in practice. |
| <b>Not meeting expectations<br/>0-1</b>      | The response does not address the criteria or simply re-states the criteria.  |

| <b>PART 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Up to 5 points, 25 weighted points)</b>   |   |  |   |                                    |
|---|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>0 - 1</b><br>Not meeting expectations  | <b>2</b><br>Somewhat meeting expectations | <b>3</b><br>Moderately meeting expectations  | <b>4</b><br>Highly meeting expectations | <b>5</b><br>Exceeding expectations |
| <p>The Executive Summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Demonstrates an understanding of the NDE's needs.</li> <li>2) Presents a clear overview of proposed solution.</li> <li>3) Demonstrates an understanding of the nature and scope of the work involved.</li> <li>4) Justifies why they are best qualified to perform the work.</li> </ol> |   | <p><b>Explanation of Score:</b></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Positive/Distinguishing features:</p> <p>Negative/Not Clear:</p> |   |                                    |
| <b>Score out of 5</b>   |   |  |   |                                    |

**PART 2: CORPORATE OVERVIEW (Up to 5 points, 50 weighted points)**

| <p><b>0 - 1</b><br/>Not meeting expectations</p>  | <p><b>2</b><br/>Somewhat meeting expectations</p> | <p><b>3</b><br/>Moderately meeting expectations</p> | <p><b>4</b><br/>Highly meeting expectations</p>  | <p><b>5</b><br/>Exceeding expectations</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>1) The bidder must provide an overall project plan, including a timeline for the planning period that describes the applicant's capacity to oversee and manage the proposed project including evidence of adequate human, organizational, and professional resources and associated abilities to meet the needs of their proposed program, as well as their propensity to deliver results (any track record of successful projects similar to this RFP).</p> <p>2) Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget? How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects? Does the firm appear to be of sound financial standing?</p> <p>3) The competency of the professional personnel who will be assigned by the contractor to provide services during the contract. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects? Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires? How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?</p> |   |   | <p><b>Explanation of Score:</b></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Positive/Distinguishing features:</p> <p>Negative/Not Clear:</p> |  |
| <p align="center"><b>Score out of 5</b></p>   |   |   |  |  |

| <b>PART 3: TECHNICAL APPROACH: (Up to 300 Weighted Points)</b>  |   |  |   |                                    |
|---|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>3.a. Bidders Understanding of the Project Requirements (Up to 25 weighted points)</b>  |   |  |   |                                    |
| <b>0 - 1</b><br>Not meeting expectations  | <b>2</b><br>Somewhat meeting expectations | <b>3</b><br>Moderately meeting expectations  | <b>4</b><br>Highly meeting expectations | <b>5</b><br>Exceeding expectations |
| <p>1) The bidder provides an overview of their proposed solution and a discussion of how their proposal meets the project requirements and constraints described in Sections IV.A through IV.E of the RFP.</p>                          |   | <p><b>Explanation of Score:</b></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Positive/Distinguishing features:</p> <p>Negative/Not Clear:</p> |   |                                    |
| <b>Score out of 5</b>   |   |  |   |                                    |
| <b>3.b. Detailed Description of Proposed Solution (Up to 50 weighted points)</b>  |   |  |   |                                    |
| <b>0 - 1</b><br>Not meeting expectations  | <b>2</b><br>Somewhat meeting expectations | <b>3</b><br>Moderately meeting expectations  | <b>4</b><br>Highly meeting expectations | <b>5</b><br>Exceeding expectations |
| <p>1) The bidder describes their proposed solution in detail, providing a complete list of functionality, including how the solutions address the requirements and deliverables outlined in Sections IV.A. through IV.E. of the RFP</p> |   | <p><b>Explanation of Score:</b></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Positive/Distinguishing features:</p> <p>Negative/Not Clear:</p> |   |                                    |
| <b>Score out of 5</b>   |   |  |   |                                    |

| <b>3.c. Requirements Matrix (Up to 125 weighted points)</b>  |   |  |   |                                    |
|--|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>0 - 1</b><br>Not meeting expectations   | <b>2</b><br>Somewhat meeting expectations | <b>3</b><br>Moderately meeting expectations  | <b>4</b><br>Highly meeting expectations | <b>5</b><br>Exceeding expectations |
| <p>1) The bidder explains, in sufficient detail, how they will satisfy the project's technical requirements specified in <i>Attachment A, Requirements Matrix</i>.</p> <p>2) If subcontractors will be used for any of the tasks, the bidder indicates what tasks and the percentage of time subcontractor(s) will spend on those tasks.</p> |   | <p><b>Explanation of Score:</b></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Positive/Distinguishing features:</p> <p>Negative/Not Clear:</p> |   |                                    |
| <b>Score out of 5</b>  |   |  |   |                                    |
| <b>3.d. Project Planning and Management (Up to 50 weighted points)</b>   |   |  |   |                                    |
| <b>0 - 1</b><br>Not meeting expectations   | <b>2</b><br>Somewhat meeting expectations | <b>3</b><br>Moderately meeting expectations  | <b>4</b><br>Highly meeting expectations | <b>5</b><br>Exceeding expectations |
| <p>1) The bidder provides sufficient description of and a detailed project plan for Project Planning and Management, described in Section IV.E.1.</p> <p>2) The section includes a preliminary project plan along with a project timeline and major milestones, consistent with the identified funding period of the project.</p>            |   | <p><b>Explanation of Score:</b></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Positive/Distinguishing features:</p> <p>Negative/Not Clear:</p> |   |                                    |
| <b>Score out of 5</b>  |   |  |   |                                    |

| <b>3.e. Scope of Work and Deliverables (Up to 50 weighted points)</b>   |   |  |   |                                    |
|---|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>0 - 1</b><br>Not meeting expectations  | <b>2</b><br>Somewhat meeting expectations | <b>3</b><br>Moderately meeting expectations  | <b>4</b><br>Highly meeting expectations | <b>5</b><br>Exceeding expectations |
| <p>1) The bidder provides a detailed scope of work and sufficient information regarding their approach to meeting the requirements, activities, and deliverables described within section IV.E. of the RFP.</p> <p>2) If subcontractors will be used for any of the tasks, the bidder indicates what tasks and the percentage of time subcontractor(s) will spend on those tasks.</p> |   | <p><b>Explanation of Score:</b></p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Positive/Distinguishing features:</p> <p>Negative/Not Clear:</p> |   |                                    |
| <b>Score out of 5</b>   |   |  |   |                                    |



**Part 5: OVERALL SCORING (Up to 5 points, 25 weighted points)**

| <p><b>0 - 1</b><br/>Not meeting expectations</p>  | <p><b>2</b><br/>Somewhat meeting expectations</p> | <p><b>3</b><br/>Moderately meeting expectations</p> | <p><b>4</b><br/>Highly meeting expectations</p> | <p><b>5</b><br/>Exceeding expectations</p> |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proposal clearly indicates that bidder has the capacity to meet the requirements within the specified time frame.</li> <li>2) Successful experience providing similar services at a similar scale.</li> <li>3) Evidence of existing customer satisfaction.</li> <li>4) Evidence of responsiveness to state needs.</li> <li>5) Overall quality of proposal.</li> </ol> |   |   | <p><b>Explanation of Score:</b></p>             |  |
| <p align="right"><b>Score out of 5</b></p>  |   |   |   |  |

Final Scoring

| Area  | Raw Score<br>(0-5) | Weighting                           | Weighted<br>Points |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Part 1: Executive Summary   |                    | (5)                                 |                    |
| Part 2: Corporate Overview  |                    | (10)                                |                    |
| Part 3: Technical Approach<br>3.a. Bidders Understanding of the Project Requirements<br>3.b. Detailed Description of Proposed Solution<br>3.c. Requirements Matrix<br>3.d. Project Planning and Management<br>3.e. Scope of Work and Deliverables |                    | (5)<br>(10)<br>(25)<br>(10)<br>(10) |                    |
| Part 4: Cost Proposal   |                    | (20)                                |                    |
| Part 5: Overall   |                    | (5)                                 |                    |
| <b>Total Points</b>   |                    |                                     |                    |

500 Max. Score

## **Reviewer Notes**

Use this sheet to record any notes while you read and evaluate proposals. All notes become part of the Bidder's procurement history file.