

---

# AGENDA ITEM 9

**Action**

**July 28, 2016 Commission Meeting**

**Response to Requests for Proposal (RFP) for Mental Health Advocacy**

---

**Summary:** The Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC or Commission) will consider recommendations regarding the responses to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for mental health advocacy and authorize the Executive Director to act in accordance with the Commission's decision.

At its January 28, 2016 meeting, the Commission approved the scope of work and minimum qualifications for RFP and authorized the Executive Director to initiate a competitive bid process for six (6) stakeholder contracts for the following populations:

- Clients/Consumers
- Diverse Racial and Ethnic Communities
- Families of Clients/Consumers
- Parent/Caregivers of Children and Youth (under 18 years)
- Transition Age Youth (ages 16-25 years)
- Veterans

The RFPs were released on May 11, 2016. They were posted to the MHSOAC website, Cal e-Procure, and advertised through an email notification to the MHSOAC listserv.

## **Scope of Work**

Proposers were asked to develop deliverables in response to the scope of work as outlined in the RFPs in the following three priority areas:

- Advocacy
- Training and Education
- Outreach, Engagement, and Communication

## **RFP Timeline**

- May 11, 2016: RFPs released to the public
- June 24, 2016: Deadline to submit proposals
- June 27, 2016 through July 22, 2016: Multiple stage evaluation process to review and score proposals
- July 28, 2016: Results presented to the Commission

## **RFP Evaluation Process**

The entire scoring process from receipt of proposals to posting of the Notice of Intent to Award is confidential. In accordance with the State of California standard competitive selection process, all proposals were evaluated in a multiple stage process.

- **Stage 1: Administrative Submission Review**

Each proposal was reviewed by MHSOAC staff for the presence of all required documents including certification that the proposer met all minimum requirements as listed in the RFP. This first Stage was scored on a pass/fail basis. Proposals that passed the requirements of Stage 1 moved to Stage 2. *Proposals that did not meet the requirements of Stage 1 were deemed non-compliant and are not eligible to receive an award.*

- **Stage 2: Technical Review**

Proposals were scored by review panels comprised of subject matter experts from multiple state agencies during the Stage 2 evaluation. The panels reviewed and scored proposals on the following requirements:

- Desired Qualifications
- Response to the Scope of Work
- Workplan
- Letters of Support

The maximum points possible for this stage was 290 points. All proposals were required to meet a minimum point score of 200 points to move to Stage 3. *Proposals that did meet the 200 point minimum were deemed non-compliant and were not eligible to receive an award.*

- **Stage 3: Reference Checks**

For all proposals that reached the minimum point value of 200, MHSOAC staff contacted the references provided.

- **Stage 4: Evaluation of Cost Proposal**

The proposal offering the lowest total cost earns the maximum available points for this section.

- **Stage 5: Combining Proposer's Scores**

MHSOAC staff combines the points from stages 2 through 4 to determine the total scores for each qualifying proposer.

- **Stage 6: Adjustments to Score for Bidding Preferences**

MHSOAC staff determines and confirms which entities, if any, are eligible to receive a bidding preference for the Disabled Veterans and Small Business preference.

Final selection is determined on the basis of the highest overall point score and not the lowest bid. The recommended award is to be made to the proposer receiving the highest overall point score.

In the event that there are no compliant bidders for an RFP, the Commission will have options to consider that include amending the RFP or closing the solicitation and re-issuing a new RFP.

### **RFP Award and Protest Process**

Within five working days of the Commission's vote to award, unsuccessful proposers, wishing to protest the decision, must submit to the MHSOAC a letter of intent to protest. If a protest is filed within this timeframe, the RFP requires the letter of protest to describe the factors that support the protesting proposer's claim. For a protest to be successful the protesting proposer must prove one of the following:

1. The protesting proposer would have been awarded the contract had the MHSOAC correctly applied the prescribed evaluation rating standards in the RFP; or
2. The protesting proposer would have been awarded the contract had the MHSOAC followed the evaluation and scoring methods in the RFP.

As outlined in the RFPs, the MHSOAC Executive Director reviews the grounds for protest and renders a final decision.

**Enclosures:** None

**Handout:** Power Point presentation will be made available at the Commission meeting.

**Presenters:**

- Toby Ewing, PhD., Executive Director
- Angela Brand, Project Lead

**Recommended Action:** Provide guidance on awarding the stakeholder contracts and authorize the Executive Director to take the necessary steps to ensure timely execution of contracts.