

Michigan Public Health Institute

Quality Assurance Review Application

Request for Proposals

Issued By

Michigan Public Health Institute



RFP Identifier: MPHI-QAR-001

Issued on: July 22, 2019

Table of Contents

Section 1.0	Introduction.....	1
1.1	General Information	1
1.2	Agency.....	1
Section 2.0	Objective	1
Section 3.0	Scope of Work.....	2
3.1	Business Requirements	2
3.2	New Quality Assurance Review Application	2
3.3	Maintenance Services.....	5
3.4	Hosting Services (Optional).....	5
3.5	Project Deliverables	5
Section 4.0	Contractor Requirements.....	7
4.1	Organization Experience and Qualifications.....	7
4.2	Project Personnel.....	7
4.3	General Requirements	8
4.4	Communication Requirements	9
4.5	Conflict of Interest.....	9
4.6	Reporting Requirements	10
Section 5.0	Invoicing and Project Duration	10
5.1	Compensation	10
5.2	Invoicing.....	10
5.3	Project Duration	11
Section 6.0	Evaluation Methodology	11
6.1	Evaluation Committee.....	11
6.2	Evaluation Process	11
6.3	Evaluation Criteria	12
6.4	Compliance	13
Section 7.0	Sole Point of Contact	13
Section 8.0	Schedule of Activities.....	15
8.1	Key Activities.....	15
8.2	Questions.....	15

8.3	Proposal Submission Deadline	15
8.4	Consultants' Presentations.....	15
8.5	Disclaimer on Information in Solicitation.....	15
8.6	Proposal and Pre-Contract Costs.....	16
8.7	Cancellation	16
Section 9.0	Proposals.....	16
9.1	Solicitation Compliance / Proposal Rejection	16
9.2	General Instructions.....	16
9.3	Complete Proposal.....	16
9.4	Proposal Submission	18
9.5	Modification or Withdrawal of Proposals	18
9.6	Binding Offer.....	18
Section 10.0	Award and Contract.....	18
10.1	Notice of Intent to Award.....	18
10.2	Contract Terms and Conditions.....	18
10.3	News Releases.....	18

Section 1.0 Introduction

1.1 General Information

The Michigan Public Health Institute (MPHI) is soliciting competitive, responsive proposals from experienced and financially sound organizations to develop / upgrade, host, and maintain an application to support quality assurance reviews.

1.2 Agency

MPHI is a Michigan non-profit 501(c)(3) Corporation authorized under Public Act 264 of 1989 as a cooperative venture of the State of Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Wayne State University to plan, promote, and coordinate all facets of health care services. MPHI currently administers a number of business and information technology initiatives on behalf of its clients.

Section 2.0 Objective

Quality assurance reviews focus on measuring a program against its quality performance indicators to ensure that the agencies and staff performing the program work are meeting state and federal expectations.

MPHI is currently engaged in quality assurance reviews for the MI Choice Medicaid Waiver program for MDHHS. This program offers Michigan residents the opportunity to receive Medicaid-covered services similar to those provided by nursing homes in the participant's own home or other residential settings.

MI Choice has been in effect since 1998. It offers services such as community living supports, environmental modifications, private duty nursing, and personal emergency response systems. By offering these services, MI Choice gives older or disabled persons the option to live more independently, in a setting of their choosing.

Currently, MPHI conducts MI Choice quality reviews every state fiscal year using the Clinical Quality Assurance Review (CQAR) custom application and reports review findings to MDHHS. CQAR is used to document and report MI Choice quality assurance reviews. Each year, a team of qualified reviewers conduct a home visit and a record review for selected MI Choice participants to ensure that Waiver Agents (the agencies administering the MI Choice program) are in compliance with federal performance measures and state standards. The CQAR application houses the reviews and provides a way to document and report on Waiver Agents and participants.

The current CQAR application supports a team of 6 CQAR staff and 20 Waiver Agents. Waiver agents may have multiple users. MPHI anticipates a similar number of users for the new system at first, with additional users added later when the application is used by other programs performing substantially similar work.

MPHI may be expanding this line of business to include other quality assurance review work.

MPHI is seeking a contractor to develop an application that is similar to the existing CQAR system but with upgraded functionality, new modules, improved portability, and enhanced reporting. In addition, MPHI is looking for a contractor that will host the application and perform maintenance after successful implementation.

Section 3.0 Scope of Work

3.1 Business Requirements

MPHI is seeking a proposal from a qualified contractor to perform the following work.

- 3.1.1 Develop and implement a new Quality Assurance Review application that will support the existing MI Choice Waiver work and future quality review opportunities. The Quality Assurance Review application is expected to be comprised of the following main modules:

- 3.1.1.1 Review Portal

- 3.1.1.1.1 Reviewers

- 3.1.1.1.2 Other Stakeholders

- 3.1.1.2 Response Portal

- 3.1.1.3 Reports

- 3.1.1.4 User Manager

- 3.1.2 Provide hosting services for the quality review application after successful implementation.

- 3.1.3 Provide maintenance services for the quality review application after successful implementation.

3.2 New Quality Assurance Review Application

This section defines the high-level expectations of the contractor in developing and implementing the new quality assurance application.

- 3.2.1 **Requirements.** MPHI is in the process of eliciting functional requirements from the CQAR Review team and anticipates eliciting functional requirements from the participating Waiver Agents and MDHHS. MPHI will work with the contractor to validate and prioritize the functional requirements at the beginning of the project. To assist the contractor in scope definition, As Is business process flows have been provided in Appendix A.

- 3.2.2 **Home Visits and Record Reviews.** The current quality assurance reviews are done in two parts. First, selected program participants are interviewed in their homes. Second, the participant records of the agency providing the services are reviewed. There is some overlap between the participants interviewed in their homes and the participants whose records are reviewed, but they are not always the same participants. The Review Portal in the new application is expected

to support the Home Visits and Record Reviews as separate activities with different protocols. In the last fiscal year, the CQAR team interviewed 170 participants and reviewed the record of 378 participants.

- 3.2.3 **Protocols.** The tools used to interview participants in their homes and to review the participant agency records are called protocols. The protocols are reviewed and revised every state fiscal year prior to the reviews. The protocols are comprised of focus areas, standards, and indicators. In general, focus areas are categories under review such as Level of Care Determination, Release of Information, and Medication Records. Standards are items within each focus area by which compliance is evaluated. For example, a standard for the Release of Information focus area asks if the participant signed the release of information form. Indicators are additional measures within a standard that determine compliance. For example, a standard regarding service offerings can include indicators that list the services offered and whether those services met standard requirements.

Standards are presented as questions with Yes, No, or NA answerers. Yes answers are considered to be in compliance (evident), no answers are out of compliance (non-evident), and NA answers are not scored. Indicators are presented as statements that are Met, Not Met, or NA. Agencies are then scored by the application based upon their compliance with the standards and indicators.

Agencies that are found out of compliance with the protocols are placed on corrective action plans.

The Review Portal in the new application is expected to support entry of the revised protocols every fiscal year, associate appropriate protocols with participants and agencies, allow the reviewers to select responses and enter comments, score the protocols by participant, standard and indicator, and score the compliance rates of the Waiver Agents. A sample protocol is included in Appendix B.

- 3.2.4 **Web-Based.** MPHI expects the new application to be web-based and to accommodate real-time interactions as well as data uploads. Reviewers performing home visits must be able to interview program participants and record and save their responses to questionnaires on tablets with touch screens, then upload the responses once they are able to connect to the application. Reviewers performing record reviews typically work in real-time on laptops or desktops, reviewing participant records uploaded from the Waiver Agent under review. In addition, the new application must work with MPHI's VPN connection.

- 3.2.5 **HIPAA Compliance.** The new application will require the exchange of information including protected health information (PHI) under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA). The winning bidder will be required to comply with all HIPAA regulations 45 CFR 160, 162, and 164. To the extent applicable, where activities to be performed require a Business Associate Agreement (BAA), the bidder will agree to the terms of the BAA as required under HIPAA.

- 3.2.6 **Workflow.** The new application is expected to include automated workflow capabilities that notify reviewers, managers, and participating agencies of pending tasks and due dates. In addition, the workflow must include management tools that enable reviewers, managers, and Waiver Agents to review, monitor, create, assign, and reassign tasks. The new application must also support corrective action plan tasks and deadlines.
- 3.2.7 **Case Management.** MPHI expects the new application to include case management functionality that associates participants with Waiver Agents and allows CQAR managers to assign reviewers to Waiver Agents and associated participants for both the Home Visits and Record Reviews. In addition, the new application must include scheduling functionality by which the Waiver Agents can schedule participants and reviewers for home visits. The new application must also enable the Waiver Agent to create and modify detailed corrective action plans and allow the CQAR Review Manager to review the plan, communicate needed changes to the Waiver Agent, and approve a final version of the plan.
- 3.2.8 **Participant Data.** The new application is expected to accommodate participant data uploads. These uploads include de-identified data of participants selected by the state, as well as participant records from the Waiver Agents. Currently, participant record data is manually uploaded through a secure exchange process. MPHI expects to store that data in the new application and, to the extent possible, automate participant data uploads.
- 3.2.9 **Response Portal.** The new application must include a portal by which Waiver Agents can enter responses to findings and provide status of any corrective action plans.
- 3.2.10 **Reports.** Review findings are communicated to Waiver Agents and MDHHS through a series of reports in the existing system. In addition, reports are currently used as case management tools. There are currently 20 reports in the system of varying complexity and size. A list of the current reports and their description can be found in Appendix C. MPHI is working to revise the existing report set with the intent of reducing the number of reports due to enhanced case management functionality. In addition, MPHI expects the development of high-level dashboards to enable CQAR management to check on review, response, and corrective action plan progress. The contractor will be expected to work with MPHI to finalize the reports and dashboards, and to implement a Reports module that allows users to generate reports in Word, Excel, and .pdf formats.
- 3.2.11 **User Manager.** The new application is expected to include a User Manager module that enables an administrator to enter new users, assign roles, change passwords, lock and unlock accounts, and deactivate existing users. MPHI expects that the new application will include industry standard user management and application security.
- 3.2.12 **Role Based.** MPHI expects the new application to be role-based. The anticipated roles in the system are Reviewer, Review Manager, Waiver Agent, Administrator, and View Only. MPHI will work with the contractor to finalize these roles and their permissions. The new application must include industry standard role-management and user-security functionality.

3.2.13 **Expandable.** MPHI may be expanding this line of business and performing similar review work for other programs. The new application is expected to easily accommodate the addition of other programs and protocols.

3.2.14 **Warranty Period.** MPHI expects that the contractor will warranty the performance of the application for 6 months from the date of implementation.

3.3 Maintenance Services

MPHI expects the contractor to provide ongoing maintenance and support for the new application once it is implemented. At a minimum, maintenance and support will include trouble-shooting, bug fixes, modifying, maintaining, and enhancing the application.

3.4 Hosting Services (Optional)

The contractor may offer to provide web hosting services for the new application. MPHI prefers that the contractor provide hosting services but will consider an option for the contractor to sub-contract a hosting service while being the sole point of contact for MPHI in any production issues that may arise. The contractor must demonstrate that the hosting service has controls or audits in place to fully protect Protected Health Information (PHI) and Personally Identifiable Information (PII). The controls or audits in place must meet the standards in the HIPAA final rule. MPHI will give preference to hosting services using Microsoft Azure.

3.5 Project Deliverables

3.5.1 Specific Deliverables

3.5.1.1 **Work Breakdown Structure (WBS).** MPHI expects an outcome-based WBS that provides the necessary framework for detailed cost estimating and control, along with providing guidance for schedule development and control. The WBS must ensure that phases are clearly separated by a deliverable. No single activity or group of activities at the lowest level of detail of the WBS to produce a single deliverable should be more than 80 hours of effort.

3.5.1.2 **Project Schedule.** The project schedule must list all of the project's milestones, activities, and deliverables, with intended start and finish dates. Elements on the schedule must include task duration and linkages of dependencies and scheduled events.

3.5.1.3 **Monthly Status Reports.** Monthly status reports must include tasks scheduled for the current month, tasks completed since last report, tasks scheduled for next month, open issues, and risks.

3.5.1.4 **Requirements Validation.** MPHI expects that the vendor will check that requirements defined for development are valid and the most reasonable options for the Quality Assurance Review Application. The requirements validation must check for errors at the

initial phase of development, as the error may increase excessive rework when detected later in the development process. Process should include:

- 3.5.1.4.1.1 Completeness checks
- 3.5.1.4.1.2 Consistency check
- 3.5.1.4.1.3 Validity checks
- 3.5.1.4.1.4 Realism checks
- 3.5.1.4.1.5 Ambiguity checks
- 3.5.1.4.1.6 Verifiability

3.5.1.5 Quality Assurance Review Application. This deliverable consists of the delivery of the design, development, testing, and successful implementation of the following modules:

- 3.5.1.5.1 Review Portal
- 3.5.1.5.2 Response Portal
- 3.5.1.5.3 Reports Module
- 3.5.1.5.4 User Manager

3.5.2 General Deliverables

3.5.2.1 All deliverables must meet MPHI-approved format and content requirements.

3.5.2.2 Each deliverable will be reviewed by MPHI and will require formal, written approval from MPHI before acceptance of the deliverable. The contractor will allow for a minimum of ten business days following receipt, per deliverable, for MPHI to review each deliverable and document its findings, except as otherwise specified. Based on the review findings, MPHI may accept the deliverable, reject portions of the deliverable, reject the complete deliverable, or require that revisions be made. The contractor will make all changes directed by MPHI. Unless otherwise agreed to by MPHI in writing, the contractor must submit replacement portions or a complete revised version of the deliverable within five business days following receipt of MPHI comments. MPHI will have an additional five business days for review whenever replacement portions or a complete revised version of a deliverable are resubmitted.

3.5.2.3 The contractor must employ an internal quality control process to ensure that all deliverables, documents, and calculations are complete, accurate, easy to understand, and of high quality. The contractor must provide deliverables that, at a minimum, are responsive to the specific requirements, organized into a logical order, contain no spelling or grammatical errors, are formatted uniformly, and contain accurate information and correct calculations. The contractor will retain all draft and marked-up documents and

checklists utilized in reviewing documents for reference through the duration of the project and project acceptance.

- 3.5.2.4 The contractor must document and deliver to MPHI its responses to comments and requests for revisions or clarification of deliverable contents.
- 3.5.2.5 At MPHI's request, the contractor will conduct a walk-through of selected deliverables. The walk-through will consist of an overview of the deliverables, explanation of the organization of the deliverables, presentation of critical issues related to the deliverables, and other information as requested by MPHI.
- 3.5.2.6 If any due date for a deliverable falls on a day that is not a business day, then the due date will be automatically extended to the next business day, unless otherwise directed by MPHI.
- 3.5.2.7 All due dates or timelines that reference a period of days will be measured in calendar days, months, and quarters unless specifically stated as business days or otherwise. All times stated in the contract will be considered to be in Eastern Time, adjusted for Daylight Saving Time as appropriate, unless specifically stated otherwise.
- 3.5.2.8 No deliverable, report, data, procedure, or system created by the contractor for MPHI that is necessary to fulfill the contractor's responsibilities under the contract will be considered proprietary.
- 3.5.2.9 Any document, deliverable, or other item delivered to MPHI for review and approval will require written approval by MPHI before the contractor may consider that document, deliverable, or other item approved.

Section 4.0 Contractor Requirements

4.1 Organization Experience and Qualifications

- 4.1.1 Interested contractors should articulate their qualifications and comment specifically on:
 - 4.1.1.1 The contractor must have a minimum of five years demonstrated experience in developing applications of similar size and functionality.
 - 4.1.1.2 Contractors with experience working with government agencies are preferred.
 - 4.1.1.3 Contractors with experience in developing applications for quality reviews are preferred.

4.2 Project Personnel

- 4.2.1 Key Personnel

- 4.2.1.1 The contractor must propose sufficient key personnel to perform the work within the time constraints of the project.
- 4.2.1.2 The proposal must include a table of proposed key personnel, their roles in the project, the percentage of time they will be committed to the work, and their qualifications to perform the work. Resumes of proposed key personnel must be included as appendices to the proposal.
- 4.2.1.3 The contractor will obtain written approval from MPHI for individuals proposed for assignment to key personnel positions.
- 4.2.1.4 The contractor must not change individuals in key personnel positions without prior written approval of MPHI. The contractor will supply MPHI with the name(s), resume(s), and references for any proposed replacement whenever there is a change to key personnel. Any individual replacing key personnel must have qualifications that are equivalent to or exceed the stated qualifications for the position, unless otherwise approved in writing by MPHI.
- 4.2.1.5 The contractor must maintain appropriate staffing levels throughout the term of the contract.

4.2.2 Personnel Availability

- 4.2.2.1 Key personnel may work remotely for this project. However, the contractor must ensure that key personnel assigned to the contract will be available onsite when deemed necessary by MPHI.
- 4.2.2.2 The contractor's key personnel must be available for all regularly scheduled meetings between the contractor and MPHI. Meetings may take place telephonically or in-person. MPHI reserves the right to require in-person meetings as deemed warranted.
- 4.2.2.3 The contractor must ensure that the staff attending all meetings between MPHI and the contractor have the authority to represent and commit the contractor regarding work planning, problem resolution, and program development.
- 4.2.2.4 At MPHI's direction, the contractor must make its key personnel assigned to the contract available to attend meetings as subject matter experts with stakeholders, both within the state government and with external or private stakeholders.
- 4.2.2.5 The contractor will respond to all telephone calls, voicemails, and emails from MPHI within one business day of receipt by the contractor.

4.3 General Requirements

- 4.3.1 MPHI will contract with only one organization, the contractor, and will work solely with that organization with respect to all tasks and deliverables to be completed, services to be rendered, and performance standards to be met.
- 4.3.2 The contractor may not subcontract the review application development or maintenance portions of the work. The contract may sub-contract hosting services if hosting services are not a regular part of the contractor's business. The contractor must be the sole point of contact for all services rendered.
- 4.3.3 The contractor may be privy to internal policy discussions, contractual issues, price negotiations, and confidential medical information. The contractor must consider and treat any such information as confidential and must not disclose it to any third party without the written consent of MPHI.
- 4.3.4 The contractor will work cooperatively with key MPHI staff and, if applicable, the staff of other contractors during the contract period to ensure the success of the work. MPHI may, in its sole discretion, use other contractors to perform activities related to the work that are not contained in the contract.
- 4.3.5 The contractor will maintain complete and detailed records of all meetings, presentations, project artifacts, and any other interactions or deliverables related to the project described in the contract. The contractor will make such records available to MPHI and MPHI upon request throughout the term of the contract.

4.4 Communication Requirements

4.4.1 Communication with MPHI

- 4.4.1.1 The contractor will enable all contractor staff to exchange documents and electronic files with MPHI staff in compatible formats. MPHI currently uses Microsoft Office 365. If the contractor uses a compatible program that is not Microsoft Office 365, then the contractor will ensure that all documents or files delivered to MPHI are completely transferrable and reviewable, without error, on MPHI's systems.

4.4.2 Communication with Clients, Providers, and Other Entities

- 4.4.2.1 The contractor will not engage in any non-routine communication with any client, any provider, the media, any other MPHI contractor, or the public without the prior written consent of MPHI.

4.5 Conflict of Interest

- 4.5.1 All persons or companies that are performing the work being reviewed will be deemed to be in a conflict of interest and ineligible to bid.

- 4.5.2 If the contractor becomes aware of a conflict of interest relating to this contract, the contractor will inform MPHI within one business day.
- 4.5.3 If the contractor has a conflict of interest at any point during the term of the contract, MPHI may, in its sole discretion, terminate the contractor for cause.

4.6 Reporting Requirements

- 4.6.1 The contractor will provide monthly status reports in the format directed by MPHI and containing the information requested by MPHI. Each status report must include, at a minimum, an overall percentage of deliverables completed, as well as the percentage of deliverables completed during the month.

Section 5.0 Invoicing and Project Duration

5.1 Compensation

- 5.1.1 MPHI will pay the contractor upon MPHI's review and acceptance the percentages complete in monthly status reports of each deliverable as described below:
 - 5.1.1.1 Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)
 - 5.1.1.2 Project Schedule
 - 5.1.1.3 Monthly Status Reports
 - 5.1.1.4 Requirements Validation
 - 5.1.1.5 Quality Assurance Review Application (fully tested and successfully implemented)
 - 5.1.1.5.1 Review Portal
 - 5.1.1.5.2 Response Portal
 - 5.1.1.5.3 Reports Module
 - 5.1.1.5.4 User Manager
 - 5.1.1.6 Maintenance Activities (billed as a monthly fixed price and previously agreed-upon costs for upgrades and enhancements not covered in the maintenance agreement)
 - 5.1.1.7 Hosting Services (billed as a monthly fixed price)

5.2 Invoicing

- 5.2.1 The contractor will invoice MPHI on a monthly basis as described in Appendix D - MPHI Vendor Agreement Template.
- 5.2.2 The invoice will contain the cost for each deliverable as a percentage of deliverable completed during the invoice month, if that percentage of the deliverable was accepted by MPHI during the month that the invoice covers and was received by MPHI's required due date. Acceptance of percentages complete will be based upon agreed-upon milestones in the project schedule.
- 5.2.3 MPHI will remit payment to the contractor as described in Appendix D.

5.3 Project Duration

- 5.3.1 The anticipated project start date is September 1, 2019. The end date has not been determined.
- 5.3.2 It is anticipated that the project work will cross state fiscal years. The contractor will be required to sign an agreement for the remainder of fiscal year 2019 and another agreement for the remainder of the work to be performed in fiscal year 2020. Fiscal years are from October 1 through September 30.

Section 6.0 Evaluation Methodology

6.1 Evaluation Committee

- 6.1.1 An Evaluation Committee will be established using measures to ensure the integrity of the evaluation process. These measures include the following:
 - 6.1.1.1 Selecting committee members who do not have a conflict of interest regarding this solicitation.
 - 6.1.1.2 Facilitating the independent review of proposals.
 - 6.1.1.3 Ensuring the fair and impartial treatment of all proposals.
- 6.1.2 The objective of the Evaluation Committee is to conduct reviews of the proposals that have been submitted, to hold frank and detailed discussions among themselves, and to recommend a consultant for a contract award.
- 6.1.3 The Evaluation Committee will conduct a comprehensive, thorough, complete, and impartial evaluation of each proposal received.

6.2 Evaluation Process

- 6.2.1 The evaluation of proposals will result in a recommendation for award of the contract. The contract will be awarded to the responsive and responsible contractor who offers the best value, as determined by the Evaluation Committee. In determining best value, the Evaluation Committee will consider:

6.2.1.1 Demonstrated experience

6.2.1.2 Quality of proposal and approach

6.2.1.3 Experience of proposed personnel

6.2.1.4 Cost

6.2.2 MPHI will evaluate proposals to determine if each consultant met all mandatory experience and qualification requirements. The mandatory experience requirements are scored on a Met/Not Met basis and only those proposals that meet all mandatory requirements will be considered.

6.2.3 The proposals that pass the Met/Not Met review will then be evaluated by the Evaluation Committee and rated for potential award. Rating will be based on the evaluator’s assessment of the proposal, including whether all critical elements described in the solicitation have been addressed, the capabilities of the consultant, the qualifications of the resources proposed, and any other aspect determined relevant by MPHI. Rating will be conducted according to the table below.

Rating	Explanation
0	Consultant does not address the requirement at all.
1	Consultant demonstrates minimal compliance with the requirement.
2	Consultant demonstrates acceptable compliance with the requirement.
3	Consultant demonstrates exceptional compliance with the requirement.

6.2.4 The Evaluation Committee will rank the proposals from the highest to the lowest rating and then select the top scores to evaluate the price and consider for award.

6.2.5 The Evaluation Committee may consider prior performance with MPHI and/or with MPHI clients in making its award decision.

6.2.6 The Evaluation Committee may enter into negotiations with one or more consultants on price, terms, technical requirements, or other deliverables.

6.2.7 The Evaluation Committee may, if it deems necessary, request that a consultant provide a clarifying written response, engage in discussion, or make an oral presentation. The Evaluation Committee may adjust its scoring based on the results of such activities. However, proposals may be reviewed and determinations made without such activities. Consultants should be aware that the opportunity for further explanation might not occur; therefore, it is important that proposal submissions are complete.

6.3 Evaluation Criteria

6.3.1 The evaluation criteria to be used in evaluating proposals and recommending an award from this solicitation are as follows:

Mandatory Requirements	Met / Not Met
The response includes a statement that the consultant is not debarred, suspended, or otherwise prohibited from professional practice by any Federal, State, or Local Agency.	
Contractor demonstrated a minimum of five years of experience in developing applications of similar size and functionality.	
Evaluation Criteria	Possible Ratings
The response demonstrates that the consultant is properly organized to conduct an operational and organizational assessment of services.	0, 1, 2, or 3
The response demonstrates the consultant's understanding and qualifications for completing the scope of the work.	0, 1, 2, or 3
The response demonstrates the consultant's ability to perform the work as indicated by the resumes of the key personnel proposed.	0, 1, 2, or 3
The response includes a proposed WBS and a timeline that demonstrates a reasonable completion of the work.	0, 1, 2, or 3
The response demonstrates the consultant's approach to and understanding of developing a new quality review application.	0, 1, 2, or 3
The response demonstrates the consultant's ability to maintain the new quality review application once implemented.	0, 1, 2, or 3
The response demonstrates the consultant's ability to provide hosting services.	0, 1, 2, or 3
The proposed budget and fees demonstrate best value.	0, 1, 2, or 3

6.4 Compliance

6.4.1 It is the contractor's responsibility to assure that the proposal is complete in accordance with the direction provided within all solicitation documents. Failure of a contractor to provide any required information and/or failure to follow the response format set forth in this RFP may result in disqualification of the proposal.

Section 7.0 Sole Point of Contact

The sole point of contact for this request for proposals is:

Kristi Bente
 Business Analyst Manager
 Michigan Public Health Institute
 2465 Woodlake Circle, Suite 180
 Okemos, MI 48864
kbente@mphi.org

Section 8.0 Schedule of Activities

8.1 Key Activities

The schedule of key activities for this request for proposals is as follows:

Activity	Date
Questions Deadline	July 26, 2019
Respond to Questions and Answers	August 2, 2019
Proposal Submission Deadline	August 9, 2019
Selection and Notification of Award	August 16, 2019
Start Date (Estimated)	September 9, 2019
MPHI reserves the right to revise the dates in this schedule.	

8.2 Questions

8.2.1 Questions regarding this request for proposals must be received by MPHI before 5:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on July 26, 2019. Questions must be submitted by email to kbente@mphi.org.

8.2.2 Inquiries received by MPHI by the Questions Deadline will be responded to by MPHI via email and posted on <https://www.mphi.org/2019/07/17/rfp-7-22-19/>. Questions received after the Questions Deadline will not be included in MPHI's response.

8.3 Proposal Submission Deadline

8.3.1 Proposals must be received before 5:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time on August 9, 2019. It is the responsibility of the consultant to ensure that MPHI receives the complete proposal on or before the proposal submission deadline.

8.3.2 Proposals received after the proposal submission deadline will not be considered.

8.4 Consultants' Presentations

Consultants that submit timely bids and pass the mandatory requirements review may be invited to make a presentation during the response evaluation process. MPHI prefers that these presentations take place in-person, on-site at MPHI.

8.5 Disclaimer on Information in Solicitation

All statistical and fiscal information contained within this solicitation and its appendices and any amendments and modifications thereto reflect the best and most accurate information available to MPHI at the time of solicitation preparation. No inaccuracies in such data will constitute a basis for legal recovery of damages or protests, either real or punitive, except to the extent that any such inaccuracy was a result of intentional misrepresentation by MPHI.

8.6 Proposal and Pre-Contract Costs

MPHI is not liable for any costs incurred by consultants prior to issuance of a legally executed contract or procurement document. No property interest of any nature shall occur until a contract is awarded and signed by all concerned parties.

8.7 Cancellation

MPHI reserves the right to cancel this entire request for proposals or individual phases at any time, without penalty.

Section 9.0 Proposals

9.1 Solicitation Compliance / Proposal Rejection

- 9.1.1 Failure of a consultant to comply with or meet all requirements or respond to any additional requests for information may result in the consultant's proposal being disqualified or determined not acceptable. MPHI reserves the right to reject any or all proposals for non-compliance, to waive informalities and minor irregularities in proposals received, and to accept any portion of a proposal or complete proposals if deemed in the best interest of MPHI. Such disqualification or determination may occur at any point following the proposal submission deadline.

9.2 General Instructions

- 9.2.1 Consultants must adhere to the content required for proposal responses. The consultant's proposal response and attachments will:
 - 9.2.1.1 Present writing that is responsive, succinct, self-explanatory, and well-organized on pages that are consecutively numbered and in a consistent numbering format.
 - 9.2.1.2 Be concise but provide complete responses.
 - 9.2.1.3 Present attachments that are labeled with wording related to the requirement or topic covered within the attachment.

9.3 Complete Proposal

- 9.3.1 A complete proposal must include the following:
 - 9.3.1.1 Table of Contents
 - 9.3.1.2 Executive Summary
 - 9.3.1.2.1 The Executive Summary must be factual and should succinctly cover the core aspects of the consultant's staffing, methodologies, and approaches to fulfill the scope of work within the solicitation.

9.3.1.3 Proposal

- 9.3.1.3.1 The proposal must consist of the consultant's full and complete response to the scope of work.
- 9.3.1.3.2 The proposal must include descriptions of consultant's areas of expertise and experience in providing this type of work.
- 9.3.1.3.3 The proposal must include a high-level WBS and project schedule.
- 9.3.1.3.4 The proposal must include a summary table of proposed key personnel, their roles in the project, and their qualifications to perform the work.

9.3.1.4 Resumes Appendix

- 9.3.1.4.1 This appendix must include the resumes of all key personnel proposed for the project.

9.3.1.5 Experience and References Appendix

- 9.3.1.5.1 This appendix must include descriptions and dates of at least three similar projects.
- 9.3.1.5.2 This appendix must include the names and contact information for at least three references.

9.3.1.6 Cost Proposal Appendix

- 9.3.1.6.1 The Cost Proposal must include the consultant's fixed price proposal for the scope of work.
- 9.3.1.6.2 The Cost Proposal must include the completed Cost Summary provided in Appendix E.
- 9.3.1.6.3 The Cost Proposal must include the conditions, procedures, approvals, and rates for out-of-scope work

9.3.1.7 Financial Statement

- 9.3.1.7.1 The financial statement must be a separate document from the rest of the proposal.
- 9.3.1.7.2 The financial statement must include sufficient information to demonstrate that the consultant has the financial strength to maintain a contract resulting from this solicitation.
- 9.3.1.7.3 **Financial information will be held in confidence by MPHI and only used to evaluate a consultant's financial strength.**

9.4 Proposal Submission

Proposals must be submitted via email to kbente@mphi.org as either Word or .pdf documents. Proposals submitted in hard copy will not be considered.

9.5 Modification or Withdrawal of Proposals

Proposals may not be modified after the submission date. Consultants may withdraw from consideration at any time during the selection process.

9.6 Binding Offer

A proposal submitted in response to this solicitation is a binding offer.

Section 10.0 Award and Contract

10.1 Notice of Intent to Award

The winning consultant will be notified via e-mail and the award will be published on <https://www.mphi.org/2019/07/17/rfp-7-22-19/>.

10.2 Contract Terms and Conditions

The contracting document resulting from this solicitation will be substantially similar to the sample contract included with this solicitation as Appendix D.

By submitting a proposal, the consultant confirms its willingness to enter into a contract that contains terms and conditions substantially similar to the sample contract and the requirements of this solicitation.

10.3 News Releases

News releases pertaining to this solicitation or intent to award shall not be made prior to the execution of the contract or without prior written approval by MPHI.