

Office on Aging - HICAP/MIPPA
RFP 012-2436601-RG

PROPONENT: Council on Aging - Southern California

	E1	E2	E3
Criteria A: Proposed Prog. Svcs., Methology, and Comparability of RFP Objectives			
Maximum Points Available: 35			
Question 1	4	4	5
Question 2	4	4	5
Question 3	3.5	4	4
Question 4	5	5	5
Question 5	3.5	3.5	4
Question 6	3.5	3.5	4
HICAP			
Question 1	4	4	5
Question 2	4	4	5
Question 3	5	5	5
Question 4	5	5	5
Question 5	4	4	5
Question 6	5	4	5
Question 7	4	4	5
Question 8	4	4	5
Question 9	4	4	5
Question 10	4	4	5
MIPPA			
Question 1	4	4	4
Question 2	4	4	4
Question 3	4	4	5
Question 4	4	4	5
Question 5	4	4	5
Question 6	5	4	4
Question 7	4	5	5
Total	95.50	95.00	109.00
Average Score	4.15	4.13	4.74
Points Awarded	29.05	28.91	33.18

Maximum Points shown are for sample purposes only. Maximum points for each category will be customized accordingly.

- 0 = Unacceptable
- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Below Average
- 3.5 = Average
- 4 = Above Average
- 5 = Excellent

Criteria B: Experience and Organizational Qualifications of Personnel			
Maximum Points Available: 35			
Question 1	5	5	5
Question 2	5	5	5
Question 3	5	5	5
Question 4	5	5	5
Question 5	5	5	5
Question 6	4	5	5
Total	29.00	30.00	30.00
Average Score	4.83	5.00	5.00
Points Awarded	33.81	35.00	35.00

Criteria C: Adequacy of Facilities and Infrastructure			
Maximum Points Available: 10			
Question 1	4	5	4
Question 2	5	5	5
Question 3	5	5	5
Question 4	4	5	5
Question 5	4	4	5
Total	22.00	24.00	24.00
Average Score	4.40	4.80	4.80
Points Awarded	8.80	9.60	9.60

Criteria D: Cost Effectiveness			
Maximum Points Available: 20			
Question 1	5	5	5
Question 2	5	5	5
Question 3	3.5	4	4

Human Services Final Evaluation Scoring Sheet

Question 4	3.5	3.5	4
Total	17.00	17.50	18.00
Average Score	4.25	4.38	4.50
Points Awarded	17.00	17.52	18.00

Total Points Awarded per Evaluator 88.66 91.03 95.78

Total Combined Points Awarded by all
Evaluators 275.47

**Average of All Points Awards - Final
Proposal Score 91.82**

Human Services Final Evaluation Scoring Sheet

**Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program (HICAP)
 Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act (MIPPA) Services
 RFP # 012-2436601-RG
 Summarized Scoring Sheet**

	E1	E2	E3	TOTAL SCORE	AVERAGE SCORE
PROPONENT'S SCORES					
Council on Aging - Southern California	88.66	91.03	95.78	275.47	91.82
				0.00	0.00
				0.00	0.00
				0.00	0.00

Panel Member Concurrence



Evaluator Scoring Form
RFP No. 012-2436601-RG
<Select From Drop-down List>

Countywide

Applicant's Name: Council on Aging

Evaluator Number:

WEIGHT: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Services.
SCORE: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable" to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:
5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3.5 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

Table with 4 columns: CRITERIA - A, WEIGHT (%), SCORE (0-5), TOTAL (weight x score). Row 1: Proposed Prog Svcs. Methodology, and Comparability of RFP Objectives, 35, [blank], [blank]

Evaluator will consider the quality of the following responses:

- 1) Description of HICAP and MIPPA programs the Applicant intends to provide, focusing on description on the HICAP performance measures listed in PA 1a – HICAP Performance Measures Template and the MIPPA goals listed in PA 1b – MIPPA Work Plan Template.
2) Description of participant intake and assessment/reassessment process and list how Applicant will ensure that services are provided only to eligible participants.
3) Description of how participant will be given an opportunity to voluntarily donate/contribute to program services, methods of collecting donations/contributions, the system of confidentiality, and procedures for protecting donations from loss, mishandling or theft.
4) Description of methods Applicant intends to use for program publicity and outreach, including providing information in the following languages: Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, Korean, and any additional languages to meet the needs of the community proposed to serve.
5) Description of methods Applicant will use to evaluate the quality of services.
6) Description of Applicant data collection process and how Applicant will comply with all Office on Aging reporting requirements.

HICAP

- 1) Criteria and procedures for accepting requests for individual health insurance counseling and advocacy assistance.
2) Method of ensuring that HICAP services are provided only to the defined Eligible Service Population.
3) Provide hours and days of program operations. Include a plan for participants to have reasonable counselor access via telephone and Applicant website

- 4) Plan for recruiting potential HICAP counselors (both paid staff and volunteers). Include Applicant process for pre-screening, training, supporting, and registering counselors
- 5) Description of method of ensuring that project staff and volunteers provide HICAP counseling and educational services in an objective and impartial manner, without endorsing any insurance products or plans.
- 6) Outreach and community education methods as it relates to HICAP services. Include outreach and educational/informational efforts targeted at hard to reach, low-income, and/or limited-English speaking clients
- 7) How Applicant will ensure that the program, staff, and volunteers remain free of any bias or conflict of interest, such as, but not limited to, a business relationship with insurers, health plans, or organizations posing a conflict of interest
- 8) How Applicant agency will protect participants' confidential personal (including financial and medical) information.
- 9) Will Legal Services be provided directly within the program? If so, description of how legal assistance will be offered.
- 10) If Legal Services will not be provided, describe Applicant's method of ensuring that referrals to legal assistance is available to participants as needed.

MIPPA

- 1) Applicant's plan for outreach and enrollment assistance to low-income individuals as it pertains to assistance programs related to Medicare and Medicare Part D.
- 2) Description of platform to be used use to inform and educate potential/existing low-income Medicare beneficiaries
- 3) Description of how Applicant will effectively track and monitor counseling and enrollment assistance to low-income programs
- 4) Description on how Applicant will ensure that the activities under this program will be separate and distinct from activities provided through other related funding sources
- 5) Description on how Applicant will prevent comingling data and funds from other programs that are closely related to this one
- 6) Applicant's description on how it will partner with the local Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) in order to implement this program to the Eligible Service Population.
- 7) Applicant's plan for enhancing outreach efforts related to Medicare wellness benefits and preventive services.

Score:

COMMENTS:



Evaluator Scoring Form
RFP No. 012-2436601-RG
<Select From Drop-down List>

Countywide

Applicant's Name: Council on Aging

Evaluator Number:

WEIGHT:

Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Services.

SCORE:

Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable" to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3.5 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

Table with 4 columns: CRITERIA - B, WEIGHT (%), SCORE (0-5), TOTAL (weight x score). Row 1: Experience and Organizational Qualifications of Personnel, 35, [blank], [blank]

Evaluator will consider the quality of the following responses:

- 1) Description of organization's experience as it relates to the proposed programs for which funding is sought.
2) Provide dates when Applicant's organization has provided the proposed programs/services or other similar services; the average number of participants served and/or units of service provided; and the amount of funding for this service and funding source(s).
3) Description of staffing plans for the organization using PA 4a- HICAP Staffing Plan Template and PA 4b - MIPPA Staffing Plan Template, including all program key personnel, non-key personnel, and volunteer positions.
4) Description of staff diversity, include languages and cultures, and how staff diversity is responsive to the population you propose to serve
5) Explanation of how staff training will be conducted to comply with program requirements.
6) Description of methods proposed for recruiting, training, and supervising volunteers.

Score:

COMMENTS:



Evaluator Scoring Form
RFP No. 012-2436601-RG
<Select From Drop-down List>

Countywide

Applicant's Name: **Council on Aging**

Evaluator Number: _____

WEIGHT:
Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Services.

SCORE:
Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable" to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:
5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3.5 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA - C	WEIGHT (%)	SCORE (0-5)	TOTAL (weight x score)
Adequacy of Facilities and Infrastructure	10		

Evaluator will consider the quality of the following responses:

- 1) Description of facility(ies) to be utilized to provide services, Explanation on how these facility(ies) are adequate for the needs of the program.
- 2) Description of facility disaster plan in place to maintain a continuity of services, for program participants in the event of a natural, technological and/or man-made disaster
- 3) Applicant facility site (s) features as it relates to accessibility and comfort for frail and/or disabled Older Individuals, and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations.
- 4) Applicant's method/s on how it will develop and implement controls to track property purchased with program funds in the amount of \$5,000.00 or more per item, and electronic equipment that can store confidential information, regardless of price (e.g., computers, laptops, tablets, flash drives, etc.).
- 5) Explanation of Applicant's procedures in place for the protection and recovery of vital records in the event of a natural, technological, and man-made disaster

Score: _____

COMMENTS:



Evaluator Scoring Form
RFP No. 012-2436601-RG
<Select From Drop-down List>

Countywide

Applicant's Name: Council on Aging

Evaluator Number: _____

WEIGHT:

Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Services.

SCORE:

Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable" to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3.5 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA - D	WEIGHT (%)	SCORE (0-5)	TOTAL (weight x score)
Cost Effectiveness	20		

Evaluator will consider the quality of the following responses:

- 1) Applicant's budget for the proposed services for both HICAP and/or MIPPA
- 2) HICAP Performance Measures form indicating proposed HICAP services using PA 1a – HICAP Performance Measures Template. MIPPA Work Plan indicating proposed objectives and key tasks using PA 1b – MIPPA Work Plan Template
- 3) Explanation on how Applicant will provide any additional leveraged resources (non-match cash/in-kind) anticipated. Provide details on each type of leveraged resource Applicant plans on using to provide services. Demonstrate ability to provide more services through leveraged resources.
- 4) Explanation on how Applicant will maintain level of services and efficiently operate the business in the event of funding decreases (California Department of Aging and/or leveraged resources) and/or payment delays.

Score:

COMMENTS:

[Empty box for comments]



Evaluator Scoring Form
RFP No. 012-2436601-RG
<Select From Drop-down List>

Countywide

Applicant's Name: Council on Aging

Evaluator Number: _____

WEIGHT:

Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Services.

SCORE:

Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable" to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3.5 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIAS	WEIGHT (%)	SCORE (0-5)	TOTAL (weight x score)
Criteria A: Proposed Prog Svcs. Methodology, and Comparability of RFP Objectives	35		
Criteria B: Experience and Organizational Qualifications of Personnel	35		
Criteria C: Adequacy of Facilities and Infrastructure	10		
Criteria D: Cost Effectiveness	20		