

Scoring Guidance for INDOT Professional Services RFP Items

Provided by INDOT



Updated: 03/03/2023

Professional Services

- The INDOT Professional Services Contract Administration Manual is a resource for understanding the professional services standard qualifications based selection process. The INDOT Professional Services Contract Administration Manual is available for review at: <https://www.in.gov/indot/doing-business-with-indot/consultants/>

Guidance and Knowledge Check

- The scoring guidance with knowledge check is required for the following INDOT owner office RFP items:

- Capital Program Management
- Construction & Materials Management
- Operations

Before a team lead or scorer can be assigned to score items generated from these offices, team leads and scorers must successfully complete the knowledge check.

- INDOT Contract Administration shall be responsible for maintaining the list of approved team leaders and scorers.

Establishing Roles

- RFP item owner offices shall identify a team leader for the scoring process for each RFP item prior to RFP advertisement.
- There shall be a minimum of three scorers and not exceeding seven scorers assigned for each RFP item.
- Approved scorers with the most experience and familiarity relevant to the advertised services shall be assigned as scorers for scoring RFP items.

Establishing Roles

(continued)

- The Director of Bridge Design and Director of Highway Design & Tech Support will be invited to provide a scorer for items that involve bridge inspection, bridge design or complex road design.
- If an RFP item involves complexity for an area of services other than road or bridge design, at least one scorer from the specialty area shall be included as a scorer on the RFP item.
- Occasionally, when deemed necessary to obtain the best qualified scorers for a particular item, INDOT may invite non-INDOT personnel to participate in the scoring process.

Communications with Consultants

- INDOT Department owner offices, team leaders and scorers associated with RFP items shall not participate in communication with consultants (or their agents) regarding:
 - The status of the selection process
 - Entertain any communications related to marketing, etc.during the time period between advertisement and the announcement of final consultant selections for the RFP.
- This policy does not apply during special marketing events advertised and scheduled by INDOT.

Communications with Consultants (continued)

- Communications that are always permissible include project administration activities for awarded contracts, scope and negotiation activities for projects selected but not under contract and training or related activities.

Review and Evaluation Process

(continued)

- Score Letter of Interest (LOI) responses based upon the criteria established in the RFP advertisement information.
 - Information included in the RFP item advertisement
 - Scoresheet Criteria
- LOI responses shall be individually evaluated and individually scored. Scores of “0s” must not be given to all LOI responses for all categories.

Review and Evaluation Process

- Scoring team members are responsible for thoroughly reviewing LOIs and associated supporting documents.
- The score sheet used to score LOI responses shall not vary from the score sheet included in the RFP advertisement.

Conflict of Interest

■ Does a Conflict of Interest Exist?

Scorer's Agreement

The primary purpose of scoring for this RFP is to identify the best firm for the scope of work advertised. It is the responsibility of INDOT scorers to make every effort to identify the firm most capable of producing the highest quality deliverables in a timely and cost effective manner without regard to personal preference. Historical performance data and references should be sought out and applied to the maximum extent necessary to make the best professional judgment possible. All information contained in Letters of Interest, scoring documents, and scoring tabulations, including the names of the scoring team, consultant ranking and shortlist information is to be considered confidential until such time as all associated contracts with an item are executed and the information is published for public viewing. Divulging details regarding the above confidential information will result in discipline and may result in dismissal. IC 4-2-6-9 prohibits state employees from participating in decision making in certain circumstances such as those in which the employee or a family member would have a potential financial interest in the outcome. Scorers shall abide by the ethical requirements set forth in IC 4-2-6-9.

All scoring documents will be published to the Internet for public information upon execution, approval and awarding of the contracts. This scoring documentation will then become important information to the submitting consultants for obtaining feedback on their Letters of Interest regarding INDOT's evaluation of their qualifications, past performance and capabilities. The consultants will be relying on your scoring to focus their improvement activities. Accurate evaluation without regard to personal relationships is a must to obtain the improvement in performance desired by INDOT and the consultant.

I have read and understand the Scorer's Training Guide available for review at: [INDOT: Doing Business with INDOT: Proposals & Contracts](#) prior to scoring the Letters of Interest for RFP {RFP_number} and I completed the scoring guidance knowledge check, when applicable. I understand the importance of using due diligence in determining scores for each Letter of Interest associated with the items that I will be scoring. I understand the confidential nature of the information and materials.

☒ I affirm the above Statement

- If there is a conflict or possible appearance of a conflict of interest ask to be removed from the scoring team.

Communications during Scoring

- Scoring is completed in a confidential manner.
 - There shall be no communications with consultants (or their agents) regarding RFP Items being scored.
 - There shall be no discussion about scoring with other scorers.
 - Scorers may confidentially discuss LOI content with other INDOT personnel or with other scorers.
 - Scorers may communicate with the assigned team lead of the RFP item the scorer is scoring.

If an RFP item requires a reference check, the reference check shall be completed by the Contract Administration office so that feedback may be shared with all scorers.

Scoring

- Information available to scorers:
 - PSCS Performance Evaluation module link
 - Active and Pending Contract Balances (capacity)
 - Current and Completed Projects (capacity & references)

The screenshot displays the 'Item Maintenance' interface. At the top, the 'Item Header' section shows details for Item ID: 2638, RFP #: 1506, and Item #: 01. The 'RFP Date' is 06/09/2015, and the 'Contract Type' is 'On Call'. The 'Item Process Status' is 'Scoring Started', and the 'Item Status' is 'Active'. The 'Owner Office' is 'Crawfordsville Dist / Production', and the 'Item Description' is 'On Call - Environmental Services'. Below the header, there is a 'Back to Summary Page' link. The main content area is divided into three sections: 'Scorer' (Heather McIntosh), 'Firm' (Lochmueller Group, Inc.), and 'Past Performance' (Performance Evaluation). A red arrow points to the 'Performance Evaluation' link. To the right of these sections is a 'Submitted Documents' table with links for Letter of Interest (LOI), Affirmative Action Certificate (AAC), Current and Completed Projects (CCP), Active and Pending Contract Balance Form (APB), and List of Sub-contractors. Below the main content area is the 'Upper Scoresheet' table.

| Category | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|----------------|
| Capacity of Team to do Work | <input type="checkbox"/> -3.00 | 20.00 | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 0.00 | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 1.00 | | |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <input type="checkbox"/> -3.00 | 15.00 | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 0.00 | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 1.00 | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 2.00 | | |

Capacity

(continued)

- Scorers need to be very careful to not evaluate capacity in a way that unnecessarily directs selections to the largest firms. This is not a rating of the size of firm, but an evaluation of the capacity of a firm to perform the work needed from a contract.

Capacity

(continued)

- Scorers not able to determine a substantive difference between firms using the below descriptions are encouraged to rate firms as either "0" or "1".

| Upper Score | | | | Lower Score | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------|--------|------------------|
| Capacity of Team to do Work | Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | Project Manager | Project Understanding and Approach | Quality | Schedule | Responsiveness | Budget | Constructability |
| 5.00 | 15.00 | 40.00 | 15.00 | 3.30 | 8.50 | 9.70 | 8.00 | 0.00 |
| 5.00 | 30.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 4.40 | 12.50 | 12.20 | 1.80 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 15.00 | 40.00 | 15.00 | 2.10 | 8.50 | 7.80 | 2.60 | 0.00 |
| 5.00 | 15.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 3.60 | 10.50 | 10.00 | 3.20 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 15.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 4.10 | 13.20 | 10.30 | 3.70 | 0.00 |
| 5.00 | 15.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 3.40 | 7.00 | 8.10 | 5.70 | 0.00 |
| 5.00 | 30.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 3.80 | 8.50 | 7.80 | 2.60 | 0.00 |
| 5.00 | 15.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 2.20 | 6.50 | 7.10 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| 5.00 | 15.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 7.80 | 3.80 | 0.00 |
| 5.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 4.60 | 7.50 | 8.40 | 3.70 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 3.60 | 11.00 | 9.50 | 3.80 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 15.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 3.80 | 10.00 | 9.00 | 4.50 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 1.90 | 9.00 | 7.30 | 1.80 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 15.00 | 3.80 | 6.00 | 9.30 | 0.70 | 0.00 |

Capacity

(continued)

- INDOT on-call contracts are typically four year contracts and the normal assumption is that the selected firm should be able to deliver an annual production rate of about 1/4 of the contract amount per year.
- Firms with capacity to deliver services at a rate substantially faster may be rated higher and firms we do not believe can deliver at the base expectation rate should be rated negatively.
- For reference, a typical full time individual should be expected to deliver at least \$200,000 of work per year. Most firms should be rated as “0” or “1”.

Capacity

(continued)

- Existing contract workload information is available at:
 - INDOT Answers
 - Professional Services Dashboard (9B)
 - SAA Report (Recent selection information)
 - On-Call Contract Availability (List of existing contracts with balances)
 - Active Consultant Contracts Report (All existing contracts)

Performance Evaluation Data

- Aggregate performance data averages are sometimes automatically applied to scoresheets from the PSCS application, however, this does not relieve selection scorers from the responsibility of reviewing specific performance data when appropriate.
- A link to Performance evaluation data is available within the PSCS Contract Administration scoring panel.

The screenshot displays the PSCS web application interface. On the left, a sidebar menu includes links for Home, Evaluations, Reports, Reference Data, System Maintenance, and User Guide. The main content area is titled 'PSCS Contract Administration' and features a 'Performance Evaluation' section. This section includes a 'Select Report' dropdown menu, a 'Details Report Parameters' panel with fields for Firm Name, Start Date, End Date, Number of Evaluations to be considered, and Performance Type. Below this, there is a 'Performance Evaluation' table with columns for Category, Score, Weight, and Weighted Score. A red arrow points to the 'Performance Evaluation' link in the sidebar menu.

| Category | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|--|-------|--------|----------------|
| Rating or predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | |

Performance Evaluation Data

(Continued)

- Aggregate performance data applied directly on scoresheets is based on Performance Types pre-defined for each RFP item.
- Scorer assigned ratings should not be based upon the auto-calculated scores already applied, but instead should be based on
 - Qualification information in the Letters of Interest.
 - Relevant past experience with the firm on performance data research related to individual project managers.
 - Significant sub consultants not incorporated in the aggregate scores.

Performance Evaluation Data

(Continued)

- When reviewing reports look for negative scores within applicable performance types and look at score averages. Individual performance evaluations can be reviewed from the home search screen using Evaluation Ids from details reports.
- Firm Report is default
 - If a sub consultant is performing an important component their data can be reviewed.
- Project Manager Performance
 - Reports ->Details Report ->Person Responsible for Deliverable-Firm

Team Lead Tabulation

- Once scorers have completed the scoring process, the team lead tabulation is ready for the team lead to evaluate the scoring.
 - Each scorer's scores are ranked by firm and the team member ranks are then totaled.
 - The preliminary firm ranking is based on rank totals with the lowest rank total being the highest ranked firm.

| Team Lead Tabulation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|------------|-------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|--|
| ✓ Scoring Step 1 Scoring Step 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scoring Step 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Firm Name | Ranking | Rank Total | Total Score | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | |
| | 1 | 10 | 383.40 | 65.68 | 1 | 80.68 | 3 | 78.18 | 2 | 95.68 | 1 | 63.18 | 3 | |
| | 1 | 10 | 353.75 | 55.75 | 2 | 85.75 | 2 | 78.25 | 1 | 70.75 | 3 | 63.25 | 2 | |
| | 3 | 15 | 323.85 | 38.77 | 4 | 86.27 | 1 | 71.27 | 3 | 63.77 | 6 | 63.77 | 1 | |
| | 4 | 18 | 282.50 | 50 | 3 | 60 | 4 | 50 | 5 | 72.50 | 2 | 50 | 4 | |
| | 5 | 27 | 229.95 | 27.49 | 6 | 59.99 | 5 | 37.49 | 7 | 67.49 | 4 | 37.49 | 5 | |
| | 6 | 29 | 207.50 | 32.50 | 5 | 32.50 | 6 | 57.50 | 4 | 50 | 8 | 35 | 6 | |
| | 7 | 35 | 150 | 25 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 42.50 | 6 | 57.50 | 7 | 10 | 7 | |
| | 7 | 35 | 117.50 | 25 | 7 | 20 | 7 | 32.50 | 8 | 65 | 5 | -25 | 8 | |

Team Lead Tabulation

- Once scorers have completed the scoring process, the team lead tabulation is ready for the team lead to evaluate the scoring.
 - Each scorer's scores are ranked by firm and the team member ranks are then totaled.
 - The preliminary firm ranking is based on rank totals with the lowest rank total being the highest ranked firm.

Team Lead Responsibilities

- Team leaders are responsible for ensuring:
 - Scorers do not apply all zeros to all categories.
 - Investigating and explaining any scoring anomalies to the Selection Review Committee (SRC).

Team Lead Tabulation

☒ Scoring Step 1 ☐ Scoring Step 2

Scoring Step 1

| Firm Name | Ranking | Rank Total | Total Score | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | |
|-----------|---------|------------|-------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|--|
| | 1 | 10 | 383.40 | 65.68 | 1 | 80.68 | 3 | 5.75 | | 95.68 | 1 | 63.18 | 3 | |
| | 1 | 10 | 353.75 | 55.75 | 2 | -25 | 8 | 3... | | 70.75 | 3 | 63.25 | 2 | |
| | 3 | 15 | 323.85 | 38.77 | 4 | 86.27 | 1 | 1.25 | | 63.77 | 6 | 63.77 | 1 | |
| | 4 | 18 | 282.50 | 50 | 3 | 60 | 4 | 1.0 | | 72.50 | 2 | 50 | 4 | |
| | 5 | 27 | 229.95 | 27.49 | 6 | 59.99 | 5 | .75 | | 67.49 | 4 | 37.49 | 5 | |
| | 6 | 29 | 207.50 | 32.50 | 5 | 32.50 | 6 | .5 | | 50 | 8 | 35 | 6 | |
| | 7 | 35 | 150 | 25 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 0 | | 57.50 | 7 | 10 | 7 | |
| | 7 | 35 | 117.50 | 25 | 7 | 20 | 7 | 0 | | 65 | 5 | -25 | 8 | |

Team Lead Responsibilities

- Scoring anomalies requiring further explanation in the comments field of the team lead tabulation are:
 - Negative scores among firms ranked for possible selection or alternate.
 - Negative scores and low ranks from one scorer for a firm that is highly ranked by the other scorers.

Team Lead Responsibilities

- If the team leader determines that anomalies are not justified, the team leader shall coordinate with the scorer and Contract Administration RFP administrator to allow reconsideration of score values.

| Ranking | Rank Total | Total Score | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank |
|---------|------------|-------------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|
| 1 | 6 | 425 | <u>130</u> | 2 | <u>125</u> | 1 | <u>85</u> | 2 | <u>85</u> | 1 |
| 2 | 10 | 250 | <u>145</u> | 1 | <u>65</u> | 4 | <u>0</u> | 3 | <u>40</u> | 2 |
| 3 | 13 | 280 | <u>85</u> | 3 | <u>65</u> | 4 | <u>130</u> | 1 | <u>0</u> | 5 |
| 4 | 16 | 80 | <u>25</u> | 6 | <u>85</u> | 2 | <u>-45</u> | 4 | <u>15</u> | 4 |
| 5 | 17 | 100 | <u>60</u> | 4 | <u>60</u> | 6 | <u>-45</u> | 4 | <u>25</u> | 3 |
| 6 | 18 | 75 | <u>45</u> | 5 | <u>85</u> | 2 | <u>-55</u> | 6 | <u>0</u> | 5 |

Investigating and explaining any scoring anomalies to the Selection Review Committee. Two scoring anomalies that will require explanation are:
1. Requested for possible selection or alternate.
2. From one scorer for a firm that is highly ranked by the other scorers.

Negative Scores

- Negative selection scoring ratings are sometimes appropriate, but should only be given after serious consideration.
- All selection scoring is published on the INDOT public website at: <https://pscsrcfp.indot.in.gov/Dashboard>

Indiana Department of Transportation

Item Details for RFP:1703 [Back to RFP Archives](#)

| RFP Item # | Item Description | Supporting Documents | LOI | Scoresheets | SRC Tabulation |
|------------|--|----------------------|-----|-------------|----------------|
| 01 | Bridge Project Development Services - Pipe Arch Bridge Replacement and Small Structure Replacement in Montgomery | Supporting Documents | LOI | Scoresheets | SRC Tabulation |
| 02 | Project Development Services - Road - HMA Functional Overlay on US 30 in Kosciusko County | Supporting Documents | LOI | Scoresheets | SRC Tabulation |
| 03 | Project Development Services - Road - Added Travel Lanes project on I 65 in Marion County | Supporting Documents | LOI | Scoresheets | SRC Tabulation |
| 04 | Project Development Services - SR 75 Bridge Replacement over Wildcat Creek in Carroll County | Supporting Documents | LOI | Scoresheets | SRC Tabulation |
| 05 | Project Development Services - Small Structure Development Services - Multi Des. | Supporting Documents | LOI | Scoresheets | SRC Tabulation |
| 06 | Road Project Development Services - Multiple Slide Corrections Project Development on SR 62 in Crawford / Perry County and US 231 in Greene County | Supporting Documents | LOI | Scoresheets | SRC Tabulation |

* Denotes file(s) in PDF format. You will need [Adobe Acrobat Reader](#) which is available free of charge at [Adobe's Website](#).

© Indiana Department of Transportation

Negative Scores

(Continued)

- Negative ratings are a significant concern to firms because all of the scoring information is available for public viewing and the scores are a public indication of INDOT's perception of a firm's ability to perform.
- Negative ratings are only applicable for a specific firm deficiency.
- Negative ratings are not for technicality issues related to omissions from the LOI.

Negative Scores

(Continued)

- When a scorer is compelled to assign a negative rating, the scorer must provide written justification to the assigned team leader. The team leader shall document the justification comments in the team lead comment section of the team lead tabulation for the SRC's review.

Item Maintenance

Item Header

Item ID: 2739 RFP Date: 06/09/2015 Item Process Status: Commence Team Lead Evaluation
RFP #: 1506a1 Contract Type: Other Item Status: Active
Item #: 01 2 Step Scoring: Yes BE Goals: No BE Goals
Owner Office: Central Office / Innovation & Enhance
Item Description: Highway Lighting Energy Cost Savings Analysis and Implementation Program

Team Lead Tabulation

☒ Scoring Step 1 ☐ Scoring Step 2

Scoring Step 1

| Firm Name | Ranking | Rank Total | Total Score | Heather McIntosh 07/06/2015 | Wei Shi 07/06/2015 | Carolyn Richardson 07/07/2015 | | | |
|-----------|---------|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---|----|---|
| | 1 | 3 | 165 | 0 | 1 | 110 | 1 | 55 | 1 |

The team lead is responsible for investigating and explaining any scoring anomalies to the Selection Review Committee. Two scoring anomalies that will require explanation are:

- Negative scores among firms ranked for possible selection or alternate.
- Negative scores and low ranks from one scorer for a firm that is highly ranked by the other scorers.

If the team lead determines that anomalies are not justified the team lead will need to coordinate with the Scorer and Contract Administration RFP Administrator to allow reconsideration of score values.

Comments

Characters left: 4000

☐ I affirm that I have reviewed the scores for this item and have documented explanations of anomalies in the comment area above.

Ranking Process

■ RFP Item Preliminary Ranking Illustration

- The sum of the rankings from each scorers score for a firm is applied to the rank total.
- Firm ranking is based on the sum of scorer ranks.

| RFP Scoring Tabulation Example | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|------|-----------|------|-------|------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| Consultants | Popeye | Rank | Olive Oyl | Rank | Bluto | Rank | Score Total | Rank Total | Firm Rank |
| ACME Consulting | 40 | 2 | 85 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 150 | 4 | 1 |
| Wayne Enterprises | 65 | 1 | 85 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 160 | 5 | 2 |
| Spacely Space Spr. | 40 | 2 | 75 | 3 | 25 | 1 | 140 | 6 | 3 |
| Wonka Engineering | 0 | 5 | 75 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 75 | 12 | 4 |
| Soylent Corp | 20 | 4 | 65 | 5 | -10 | 5 | 75 | 14 | 5 |

The preliminary selection rank is based on rank totals from lowest (best) to highest.

- The illustration above shows:

$$2 + 1 + 1 = 4 \text{ as the rank total for ACME Consulting.}$$

Ranking Process

(continued)

- Firm ranking is based on the sum of scorer ranks.
- Each scorers scores are ranked.
 - When the scores are the same, the same scores share the same rank eliminating the next rank number.

| RFP Scoring Tabulation Example | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|------|-----------|------|-------|------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| Consultants | Popeye | Rank | Olive Oyl | Rank | Bluto | Rank | Score Total | Rank Total | Firm Rank |
| ACME Consulting | 40 | 2 | 85 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 150 | 4 | 1 |
| Wayne Enterprises | 65 | 1 | 85 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 160 | 5 | 2 |
| Spacely Space Spr. | 40 | 2 | 75 | 3 | 25 | 1 | 140 | 6 | 3 |
| Wonka Engineering | 0 | 5 | 75 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 75 | 12 | 4 |
| Soylent Corp | 20 | 4 | 65 | 5 | -10 | 5 | 75 | 14 | 5 |

The preliminary selection rank is based on rank totals from lowest (best) to highest.

- The illustration above indicates in red same scorer scores with same ranks.

Ranking Process

(continued)

- The highest score total for a firm does not always result in a firm having the lowest rank total number.

| RFP Scoring Tabulation Example | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------|-----------|------|-------|------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| Consultants | Popeye | Rank | Olive Oyl | Rank | Bluto | Rank | Score Total | Rank Total | Firm Rank |
| ACME Consulting | 40 | 2 | 85 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 150 | 4 | 1 |
| Wayne Enterprises | 65 | 1 | 85 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 160 | 5 | 2 |
| Spacely Space Spr. | 40 | 2 | 75 | 3 | 25 | 1 | 140 | 6 | 3 |
| Wonka Engineering | 0 | 5 | 75 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 75 | 12 | 4 |
| Soylent Corp | 20 | 4 | 65 | 5 | -10 | 5 | 75 | 14 | 5 |
| The preliminary selection rank is based on rank totals from lowest (best) to highest. | | | | | | | | | |

- The illustration above shows the scores providing rankings that affect the final rank totals for firms.

Selection Review Committee (SRC)

- The SRC
 - Set business rules associated with the consultant selection process
 - Ensure the consultant selection process is followed
 - Determine final selection recommendations for all advertised items.

SRC

(Continued)

- The SRC determines the final selection ranking recommendations:
- Reviewing firm availability and determine SRC Selection Availability Adjustments (SAA).
- Determine actions for responses that do not comply with DBE/MBE/WBE/IVOSB requirements.

SRC

(Continued)

- Verify that recommended selections will not exceed a firm's prequalification capacity.
- Verify that a firm's key staff will not become over committed as a result of receiving multiple selections on the same RFP.
- Consult with the scoring team leader regarding any apparent scoring anomalies.

SRC

(Continued)

- Eliminate firms from the recommended selection or alternate list when there is significant concern about deficient performance or capacity.
- Ensure SRC decisions are documented by the signatures of at least three members applied to the Tabulation Forms in PSCS.
- The highest ranking selectable firms are approved as the recommended firm list in order from highest to lowest.
- On occasion, two different districts may recommend a same firm for same project type and the SRC may choose to select the next highest ranking selectable firm.

SRC

(Continued)

- The highest ranking selectable firms are approved as the recommended firm list in order from highest to lowest.
- When a firm is recommended for the same project type on two RFP items on the same RFP, the SRC may choose to select the next highest ranking selectable firm. The SRC may choose to recommend selection based upon a firm's RFP item priorities preference.

Consultant Selection Debriefing

- Feedback should be provided to firms without specifically identifying the scorers and especially without associating scorer names with their scores.
- The owner office contact person for the item will need to be the lead in providing feedback.
- When requested, the owner office contact person should look at the item scoring to identify any general observations regarding the firm deficiencies. (e.g. performance scores, project manager, approach, lower scores from a specific scorer.)

Consultant Selection Debriefing

- Upon recognition of the deficiencies, the owner office contact person should then reach out to any specific scorers that would have additional detail regarding the deficiencies and ask for feedback.
- The owner office contact person can then provide feedback to the requesting firm in a phone call or meeting.
- If, when a debriefing is requested, a scorer may personally volunteer feedback directly to the firm and this is acceptable.

Consultant Selection Debriefing

- In situations where step two scoring has occurred, firms already know the scorer names so that is a different situation and firms may reach out directly to those scorers. In those instances, the owner office contact person should be notified by the scorer(s) of the inquiry so the owner office contact can coordinate the debriefing effort.
- Feedback from debriefings can be a valuable opportunity for respondents so firms can improve their LOI submittals and scores.

Fair and Systematic Scoring Approach

- The benefits of a fair and systematic scoring approach are:
 - Industry confidence in INDOT's scoring selection process
 - Elimination of inconsistencies
 - Fewer concerns raised by firms and directed to Selection Review Committee (SRC) members and Executive staff

Summary- DOs

- ✓ **Do:** Assign scorers representing worktypes advertised in the RFP item.
- ✓ **Do:** Individually evaluate and score LOI responses.
- ✓ **Do:** Rate firms individually as “0” or “1” for Capacity category types when there is not a substantive difference among firms.
- ✓ **Do:** Provide comments for negative scores.
- ✓ **Do:** Have a debriefing after the scoring process is complete.

Summary— Do Not

✗ **Do not:** Communicate with consultants (or their agents) regarding RFP items that are:

- ✗ Advertised on the 12 Month list or on an RFP.

- ✗ Being scored

- ✗ In the selection process.

✗ **Do not:** Have discussions about scoring with other scorers during the RFP scoring process.

✗ **Do not:** Rate all firms with zeros for all scoring categories.

Knowledge Check

- Thank you for completing the INDOT RFP Scorer Guidance Training.
- Once you have completed the knowledge check you will be added to the INDOT RFP list of authorized scorers. The Approved RFP Scorer list is available at:

<https://ingov.sharepoint.com/sites/INDOTContractAdministration/SitePages/RFPProcess.aspx>

