

## ATTACHMENT 1

Category	Element	Points
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b>		<b>90 points</b>
<b>TECHNICAL PROPOSAL</b>		<b>110 points</b>
Quality of Sample		80 points
Overall Relevant Vendor Experience		30 points
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>200 points</b>

### EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

As explained in Section 4.5, proposals will be evaluated using the weighting of factors found in that section.

#### Scoring of Sample:

The Department will assess the Sample based upon the adjectival categories in Table 1.

TABLE 1	
Rating	Definition
<b>Distinctive</b>	Quality of sample exceeds the requirements in a way that promises significant benefits to the Department.
<b>Superior</b>	Quality of Sample meets all requirements; quality is beyond the stated requirements; no material weaknesses; high confidence in the quality of work.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Quality of Sample meets all requirements; Quality of Sample has no significant weaknesses; reasonable confidence in the quality of work.
<b>Marginal</b>	Quality of Sample has one or more significant weaknesses; moderate confidence in the quality of work.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Quality of Sample has several significant weaknesses; little or no confidence in the quality of work.

The adjectival rating for the specific elements of the Quality of Sample will have the point values as shown in Table 2:

TABLE 2					
	Distinctive	Superior	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
<b>Quality of Sample</b>	80	70	55	40	0

## Scoring of Prior Experience

The Department will assess the Vendor's Prior Experience based upon the adjectival categories in Table 3:

<b>TABLE 3</b>	
<b>CASE STUDY/REFERENCE</b>	
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Distinctive</b>	Past performance was recent and involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in this IFB. Reference indicated past performance significantly exceeded overall requirements and expectations; delivered significant and/or innovative impact.
<b>Superior</b>	Past performance was recent involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in the IFB. Reference indicated past performance exceeded requirements on some dimensions.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Past performance was relatively recent and involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in the IFB. Reference indicated past performance met minimum requirements.
<b>Marginal</b>	Past performance met requirements, but only after significant extra effort, significant delay, significant scope revisions were found necessary, and/or other adverse factors.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Past performance is not relevant to the requirements in the IFB, or resulted in failed project/work due to mainly to the fault of the vendor.

The adjectival rating for each Past Performance Reference Case Study will have a point value as shown in Table 6:

<b>TABLE 4</b>					
	<b>Distinctive</b>	<b>Superior</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Marginal</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Overall Relevant Experience</b>	30	25	20	15	0

**NOTE:** In the event the vendor fails to respond to any of the evaluation elements identified in Evaluation and Award Process Section, the vendor may receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating for the corresponding evaluation element.

