

# RFP ON-002786 - Responsible Driver Program Delivery

## 1 Introduction

Proponents spend a significant amount of time preparing and supporting the offers they submit to provide professional and technical services to the British Columbia Government. The Government benefits from this investment since it contributes both quality and choice to government's plans. In return for this effort, Proponents are entitled to a full and fair evaluation. Since evaluation is inherently judgement, significant care is required to manage the objective and subjective dimensions of the process. This guide is intended to help address this requirement.

### 1.1 Response Evaluation Process and Rules

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of evaluators that will represent the Province.

These rules will guide the evaluation:

1. A representative of the Ministry shall be responsible for the overall conduct of the evaluation and may establish such rules or procedures as it may reasonably determine are required. An evaluation chair person will
2. The evaluators shall be the same people from the beginning to the end of the evaluation. Further, each evaluator will remain consistent in the section(s) they evaluate from each proposal. For instance, if three evaluators evaluate the first section in one proposal, they will also evaluate the same section in all proposals.
3. Evaluators shall not discuss any aspect of the evaluation or share any information submitted, including proposals and other documents, with anyone other than members of the evaluation team.
4. The Purchasing Services Branch (PSB) will be the custodian of all documents received by the Province. Responses and related documents will be returned to PSB at the completion of the process.
5. Prior to detailed evaluation of the responses one or more members of the evaluation team will review the submissions to ensure that all mandatory criteria have been met. If all mandatory criteria are not met, this will
6. For each response that meets the mandatory criteria, the evaluators will review that submission without reference to any other of the responses made, with the exception of price.
7. Drawing solely upon the information specified within the Request for Proposals, and in a manner free from bias and conflict, each evaluator will assign a score to each criterion and that score will be discussed with
8. All efforts will be made to achieve consensus. In the event that consensus cannot be reached, the final score will be the whole number from the evaluation scoring system closest to the average of the evaluators'
9. Any comments pertinent to the assessment of the criteria will be entered into the workbook for review with the Proponents at the conclusion of the process.
10. All questions about the evaluation made, during or following the evaluation, by persons who are not part of the evaluation, shall be referred to the evaluation chair.
11. Questions for Proponents arising as part of the evaluation process will be documented. The evaluation chair will handle all communication between Proponents and the evaluation team.
12. All information related to this evaluation must be retained in a secure environment at all times.
13. All Proponents will be offered a debriefing session at the conclusion of the process that **will be attended by all evaluators**, or person's designated by the evaluation team

## Scoring Methodology

This RFP is structured to solicit a response from Proponents that will provide evaluators sufficient information to assess a firms or individuals experience against the criteria that was defined in the RFP

Due to the subjective nature of this assessment, it is essential that evaluators enter into the appropriate place in this evaluation workbook any comments, which qualify the score awarded.

Each requirement has been assigned a weight prior to the evaluation commencing. This weight is displayed in column D in the Desirable Requirements worksheet. Evaluators will make an assessment of the Responses ability to satisfy a requirement and will assign a score by consensus according to the following scale unless another scale is provided in the instructions to evaluators:

Guideline	Quality	Points Awarded
Proposal offers the highest level of exceptional features with no added risk.	Exceptional	10
Exceeds expectations, and any added risk deemed acceptable.	Above Average	8
Proposal meets expectation and all minimum requirements.	Average	6
Proposal arguably meets the stated requirements and risks may be evident.	Poor	4
Proposal has deficiencies and would lead to loss of desired service levels.	Below Requirements	2
No response or a response that is not relevant to the requirement.	No response	0

[illegible]

Stroh Health Care	
Met? (Y)	Comments
Y	
Y	
Y	three copies plus an e copy, plus one copy of MADD Video
General Comments	

Desirable Requirements				s.21
	Proposal should address	Section weight	Rel. weight	
Proponent Experience		20		
4.1. Proponents' Experience and Qualifications				
The Proposal should include a detailed description of the services the Proponent has previously and/or is currently delivering, and list the duration and scope of any similar contracts undertaken by the Proponent including jurisdictions similar to B.C. and	Proposal should demonstrate a background in delivering services of this type.			s.13
include at least three references from customers that can attest to the Proponent's performance.	References have been provided. Score 10 if they have provided at least 3 references that appear similar. The veracity of the references will be assessed at the conclusion of the evaluation			
Proponents should also include a description of its past experience with: a) group education and/or counselling;	Proposals should demonstrate at least three years experience in the subject matter and preferably with the resources put forward.			
b) development and use of screening tools;	Proposals should demonstrate at least three years experience in the subject matter and preferably with the resources put forward.			
c) curriculum development;	Proposals should demonstrate at least three years experience in the subject matter and preferably with the resources put forward.			
d) employee training; and	Proposals should demonstrate at least three years experience in the subject matter and preferably with the resources put forward.			
e) multiple service delivery locations.	Proposals should demonstrate at least three years experience in the subject matter and preferably with the resources put forward.			
Proposals should include a list of the core team that would provide services in relation to the RDP, including the service manager. This list should include their credentials and experience relevant to this program.	The core team posssss experience in: curriculum development employee or sub contractor training program development screening tools quality assurance multiple, geographically dispersed delivery locations.			
Proponents should provide a succession plan that will ensure business continuity of the core team and of service delivery.	Proposals should include a plan that should serve to ensure service performance levels in the event of a catastrophic departure of key staff.			

Stroh Health Care	
Score	82.1
16.5	Meets Minimum

s.21

s.21

<b>Desirable Requirements</b>			
<b>4.2. Data Collection, Reporting and Database</b>			
Proponents should include detailed information outlining their experience and processes for the following:  a) data collection and sharing of data with organizations such as RoadSafetyBC;	Proposal demonstrates experience with data collection for public organizations, with a geographically diversified clients base.	s.13	
b) development and maintenance of a secure database for the provision of the services;	Proposal demonstrates experience developing, maintaining and working with a secure database that utilize most of the fields as identified in 4.2		
c) access control of any data that is in the possession of the Contractors organization;	Proposal demonstrates that RS BC will have direct access to the data as documented in 4.2		
d) compliance with the protection of privacy of personal information in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and with the privacy, confidentiality and security provisions of the Contract; and	Proposal demonstrates compliance with the provisions of the contract.		
e) how requests for information from RoadSafetyBC will be managed.	Reports as cited in the RFP will be provided and a mechanism is provided that will enable it.		
<b>4.3. Conflict Resolution</b>			
Proponents should include detailed information describing their experience and procedures for the following:  a) any proposed conflict management and issue resolution plans and methods;	The proposed procedures deal with at least all three conflict topics and demonstrate an approach that should mitigate the conflict.		
b) the proposed approach for developing guidelines for Contractor employee and sub-contractors to support them in dealing with Participant complaints (e.g. complaints and challenges resulting from Participant dissatisfaction with screening and post-intervention assessment results); and			
c) the proposed approach for personnel and sub-contractors to deal with conflict and/or potential violent incidents during education and counselling components.			

s.21

<b>Stroh Health Care</b>	

s.21

s.21

<b>Desirable Requirements</b>				s.21
<b>Public Education and Program Components</b>		<b>20</b>		
<b>4.4 Public Education</b>				s.13
Proponent should describe: a) the plan for developing the public education materials;				
b) the proposed types of public education materials (i.e. brochure, advertising, etc.);				
c) the proposed approach for setting up and maintaining an up to date website; and d) a mock-up of the proposed website and content.				
<b>4.5. Program Components</b>				
4.5.2 (Screening) Each Proponent's response should address the following: a) identification of the screening tool being proposed, and a detailed outline of the tool's methodology; b) the rationale for selecting those screening tools including any supporting research;	Screening tool is developed based on evidence determined through extensive research. Supported by professional clinical alcohol and drug assessment research.			
c) identification of the entity that owns the copyright in the screening tool and a statement regarding the Proponent's rights to utilize the screening tool in the provision of the RDP services; and	Proponent has the right to utilize the screening tool.			
d) how the Proponent will work with RoadSafetyBC to set scoring thresholds and screening policies that will meet the objectives of the program	Proposal demonstrates a willingness to work cooperatively.			
4.5.3. Education  The Proponent's response should address the following: a) the minimum number of participants to run an educational program;	minimum numbers will work reasonably with regional volumes that are cited and service delivery timeframes.			
b) the details of the Proponent's proposed education process, tools, and techniques, including plans to work with RoadSafetyBC to obtain the appropriate approvals during development, and delivery;	process tools and techniques are clear and reasonable.			
c) how the Proponent plans to monitor and review the education program content and process in order to ensure the program remains current and reflects best practice over time and is administered consistently at all service delivery locations;	plan proposed should work regardless of geographic area and would provide for a consistent result.			
d) methods of providing education to Participants not able to participate or benefit from the group education arrangement i.e., Participants who have cognitive deficits, behavioural difficulties, etc.; and	plan should demonstrate a reasonable approach with a likelihood of success.			
e) details of proposed personal action plan including goals, plans, and strategies to address triggers and eliminate drinking and/or drug-affected driving behaviour	has to be clear and action oriented.			
4.5.4. Counselling The Proponent's response should address the following: a) the proposed counselling process, tools, personal action plan, and counselling checklist, including plans to work with RoadSafetyBC to obtain appropriate approvals during development;	counselling process and tools are to be clear and concise for this population.			
b) scheduling options that will be available for counselling, e.g. two eight-hour classes, eight two-hour classes, etc.;	schedules will accommodate a variety of Drivers circumstances.			

Stroh Health Care	
16.6	Meets Minimum

s.21

			s.21
<b>Desirable Requirements</b>			
c) methods of providing counselling to Participants not able to participate or benefit from a group arrangement i.e., Participants who have cognitive deficits, behavioural difficulties, etc.;	plan should demonstrate a reasonable approach with a likelihood of success.		s.13
d) proposed counselling methodology to be used with Participants, including rationale and any supporting research or information; and	demonstrate an evidence based methodology.		
e) description of how the Contractor will assist Participants with advice on where to look for further help in dealing with substance abuse and/or other problems that are beyond the scope of the RDP.			
4.5.5. Post-Intervention Assessment Proponent response should address the following: a) details of the proposed post-intervention assessment process (including recidivism risk assessment) and tools to be used;	proposed method should clearly set out how it will assess risk.		
b) how the Proponent proposes to work with RoadSafetyBC to obtain the appropriate approvals during development, and delivery; and			
c) how the post-intervention assessment process will be standardized throughout the province.			

	<b>Stroh Health Care</b>	s.21
s.21		

<b>Desirable Requirements</b>			
<b>Service Delivery</b>		<b>20</b>	
<b>4.6. Service Delivery Timeframes</b>			s.1 3
Proponents should describe the proposed method to ensure that it can and will meet these timeframes in all locations.	Proposed method should accommodate desired timeframes with limited risk and accomodates geographic location.		
<b>4.7. Service Delivery Locations</b>			
Each Proponent should describe its: a) plan to ensure trained and qualified personnel are, in respect of each location, conducting the services as of June 16, 2016;	Plan proposed should be accomodating primary locations by June 16 and be able to accommodate all locations in some manner.		
b) plan to ensure consistent service delivery regardless of geographic location;	Regardless of having physical locations, Proponent has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the plan should be successful		
c) plan to enhance the regional service delivery over the duration of the Contract; and	Plan is flexible and will continually improve service delivery.		
d) the Proponent's approach to managing the risk of fluctuating Participant volumes (higher or lower) throughout the term of the Contract.	There should be a mechanism to accommodate drops in volumes, regardless of locations while still maintaining service levels		
<b>4.8. Service Delivery Qualifications and Experience</b>			
Proponents should ensure that high level work plan provided in response to 4.13 includes sufficient information that demonstrates the ability to meet the service delivery qualifications and experience in each of the cities.	It is not necessary to have the resources secured in the Proposal, but the proposal should contain a sufficient level of expertise to enable an evaluator to understand that the the plan is drafted by someone with significant experience in this subject and accomodates resourcing each city(note this does not need to be physical offices, but at least a tangible, sustainable plan to conduct the counseling using qualified staff in the geographic area).		
<b>4.9. Hearing Impaired.</b>			
Proponents should include a detailed description of the plan to accomodate hearing impaired individuals.	plan for accomodating should be viable and fair.		
<b>4.10. Financial Information</b>		<b>20</b>	
<b>4.10.1. Charges, Fees and Pricing</b>		s.13	
a) how and when program fees and charges will be collected from the Participant;			
b) the proposed process for keeping records of charges and fee payments and also remitting the Province's per-Participant program prescribed fee;			
c) the per-Participant charge that the Proponent will charge to each Participant during the term of the Contract (i.e. the Contractor's per-Participant charge), and the rationale for the amount.			
Per participant Fee	enter as an individual price		
cancellation fees	enter as a price per occurance		
rescheduling fees	enter as a price per occurance		
other	for discussion		
other	for discussion		
Proposal price used for evaluation			

s.21

Stroh Health Care	
15.6	Meets Minimum
s.21	
s.21	
20.0	
s.21	

s.21

s.21



			s.21
Desirable Requirements			
4.10.2. Financial Accountability and Responsibility		s.13	
Proponents should include a detailed description of:	at a minimum they should accept credit cards and cheque.		s.13
a) payment mechanisms that will be accepted; and			
b) the e-commerce solution for the acceptance of payment cards over the Internet.			

Stroh Health Care		s.21
2.0		
10		
10		

<b>Desirable Requirements</b>			
<b>Security and QA</b>		<b>5</b>	
<b>4.11. Security</b>			
Proponents should include a detailed description of the plan to ensure protection and security of personal information as described in the attached Contract including:  a) the proposed approach to ensuring the protection and security of personal information; and	procedures at a minimum accommodate Security and Privacy schedules.		s.13
b) the proposed procedures that would occur in the event of an accidental breach.			
<b>4.12. Quality Assurance</b>			
Proponents should describe the Proponent's proposal for the following: a) a province-wide quality assurance program;	quality assurance consistency availability		
b) the process for continuous improvement of all RDP components; and	improvement		
c) the process for developing and refining a policy and procedures document over the course of the Contract.	collaborative		
<b>4.13. Proposed Work Plan and Timeframes</b>		<b>15</b>	
Proponents should provide a high level work plan that will include tasks, milestones and timeframes, including critical dates for the following: a) development of RDP components and business processes;	Plan should be tangible and be reasonable, with the resourcing that is being proposed to achieve the goals with limited risk.		
b) implementation approach for each RDP component, approach to managing RDP operations on an on-going basis;			
c) curriculum development and approval;			
d) finalizing any staffing or sub-contractor arrangements; and	this should include geographic dispersion		
e) development of training and communication material.			

s.21

<b>Stroh Health Care</b>	
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Meets Minimum</b>

s.21

s.21

Desirable Requirements	
	Section weight
Proponent Experience	20
Public Eduction and Program Compon	20
Service Delivery	20
4.10. Financial Information	20
Security and QA	5
4.13. Proposed Work Plan and Timefra	15

s.21

Stroh Health Care	
Score	82.1
16.5	Meets Minimum
16.6	Meets Minimum
15.6	Meets Minimum
20.0	
3.6	Meets Minimum
9.9	Meets Minimum

s.21