

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

II. Public Comment

III. CEO Overview



2450 Old Moultrie Road, Suite 103
St. Augustine, FL 32086
904-342-2267
www.elcnorthflorida.org

RFQ (Request for Qualifications)

COMMITTEE MEETING

Murray Brothers Caddyshack Restaurant (meeting room)
at World Golf Village
455 S Legacy Trail E106, St Augustine, FL 32092
May 11, 2022
11:00 a.m

TENTATIVE AGENDA

- I. Call to Order/Roll Call**
- II. Public Comment**
- III. CEO Overview**
- IV. Review of RFQ Evaluation Committee Instructions (“Ground Rules”) for the Processing of Evaluations of Proposals/Responses to the Request for Qualifications for External Auditing Services No. 2022-01**
- V. Conflict of Interest Forms**
- VI. Establish RFQ Committee Chair Person (and secondary) to present recommendation to board**
- VII. Committee Members Questions**
- VIII. Calculation and Verification of Final Scores (including RFQ Score Sheet TABULATIONS form)**
- IX. Ranking of Proposals**
- X. Committee Discussion and Final Recommendation**
- XI. Adjournment**



A United Way Agency Funded by the State of Florida



**IV. Review of RFQ Evaluation Committee
Instructions (“Ground Rules”) for the Processing of
Evaluations of Proposals/Responses to the
Request for Qualifications for External Auditing
Services No. 2022-01**

RFQ Evaluation Committee Instructions
for the
Early Learning Coalition of North Florida, Inc.

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR EXTERNAL AUDITING SERVICES
No. 2022-01

PRIOR TO THE RFQ EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING:

All evaluators will be sent their Conflict of Interest Form (to sign and return), the solicitation document and any applicable addenda, all proposals, scoring tools, questions and answers from Proposers, and any other necessary documents by April 25, 2022 to review and score through May 11, 2022. All evaluators will convene during the **RFQ Evaluation meeting May 11, 2022, 11:00 a.m.** at the Murray Brothers Caddyshack Restaurant (meeting room) at World Golf Village, 455 S Legacy Trail E106, St Augustine, FL 32092 to process all scoring.

Evaluators are chosen to participate because of their knowledge and skills, and because of the Coalition's confidence in their ability to score both independently and fairly. The same scoring principles must be applied to every response received, independent of other evaluators. Meetings of the RFQ Committee are open to the public and should be conducted in a professional manner.

1. **ALL** Questions related to the solicitation document and the evaluations of the responses **must be in writing** and directed to the Coalition's assigned Procurement Manager:

Tajaro Dixon
Early Learning Coalition of North Florida, Inc.
2450 Old Moultrie Road, Suite 103
St. Augustine, FL 32086
tdixon@elcnorthflorida.org

2. Conflict of Interest Questionnaires must to be completed, signed, and dated by all RFQ Committee members. Any identified conflicts of interest will be referred to the Coalition's attorney immediately.
3. Each evaluator will be provided a copy of the solicitation document, all attachments, amendments, and (if applicable) all offerors' inquiries, together with the written answers and documents provided by the Coalition. Each evaluator will also be provided with a copy of each Proposal before the RFQ Evaluation Meeting, which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation document and the Scoring Sheets. All Evaluators should hand write their names on their scoring sheets and their proposals (both hard copy and thumb/flash drive, if possible), AND sign and date last page of score sheet (in ink).

4. Each member of the RFQ Evaluation Committee shall independently score each response. **No collaboration will be permitted during the scoring process.** Do not ask other evaluators questions or share solicitation related information with anyone.
5. Evaluators must not solicit information or submissions from potential or interested offerors.
6. The written proposal is the basis upon which responses are evaluated and scored.
7. Only the Scoring Sheets provided with the solicitation document will be used to record your scores and comments. Any additional notes or marks that may appear elsewhere in the evaluation materials will not be admitted as a score. Each Evaluator should make sure that their name is on each score sheet for each proposal.
8. All raw scores must be assigned utilizing the scoring system provided in the RFQ document.
9. If the response does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate on the score sheet “not addressed.”
10. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. **Fractional values will not be accepted and any missing scores will be returned for scoring.** Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and responses only from the Procurement Manager, who alone, is authorized to seek additional technical help if needed. Technical assistance, if needed, will be provided by non-voting technical advisors and will be uniformly disseminated to all evaluators simultaneously.
11. No attempt by Coalition personnel or others to influence an evaluator's scoring will be tolerated. If any attempt is made to do so, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Procurement Manager. If the Procurement Manager makes such an attempt, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Coalition C.E.O. or Board Chairperson.
12. To avoid the possibility of protest, all appearances of impropriety must be avoided.
13. Following completion of the independent evaluations of the Proposals/responses, the Procurement Manager will hold the RFQ Evaluation Meeting for the purposes of assuring that information has not been overlooked in the scoring of responses, and to tabulate scores. Evaluators should work carefully to be as thorough as possible in order to help the Coalition secure a fair and open competitive procurement.
14. The RFQ Evaluation meeting is **May 11, 2022 11:00 a.m. (EST)** at the Murray Brothers Caddyshack Restaurant (meeting room) at World Golf Village, 455 S Legacy Trail E106, St Augustine, FL 32092.

DURING THE RFQ EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING:

The main purpose of the RFQ Evaluation Committee Meeting is to receive and record all evaluation scores.

It is not essential that uniformity in scoring be achieved. However, it is important to ensure that all evaluators have considered the same reference sources when scoring the information presented in the responses. Evaluators may use this opportunity to revise their scores based upon the discussions from these activities. It is acceptable for scores to remain unchanged.

It is at this meeting that the Procurement Manager (or designee) logs in and records all scores on a spreadsheet and calculates those scores according to the evaluation methodology outlined in the solicitation document. **One other committee member or staff person will witness the scores as they're recorded and will double-check the final score calculations.**

The following activities should occur prior to the conclusion of the meeting:

1. The Procurement Manager will confirm that no one has tried to influence any of the evaluators and that they have exercised their own independent judgment in scoring each response independently of any other.
(At this time – confirm this with each committee member by asking these two questions: “Has anyone tried to influence any of you? Have each of you exercised your own independent judgment in scoring each of the solicitation responses?”)
2. The Procurement Manager will fill out a spreadsheet with the names of the evaluators across the top and the number of the evaluation criterion down the left side. Each evaluator will be asked in turn for the score given to each criterion. The Procurement Manager will verbally repeat the score for validation prior to recording it. Then a witness will watch the Procurement Manager (and Coalition staff) record the score. If the scores are reasonably consistent nothing further need be done with the evaluators.
3. If the scores are significantly disparate the sole function of the Procurement Manager is to allow each evaluator to point out where in the response he or she found the material which was the basis of his score. It is important to note here that the numerical value of the score is not to be questioned. It is only the disparate nature of the score that can be reviewed.
4. No pressure is to be placed upon any evaluator to change any score. The purpose of this exercise is to ensure that each evaluator, regardless of the score, determined that score based upon the same material within the response and not upon material that did not apply or material omitted by others.

5. Should a discrepancy exist, evaluators should be given additional time to review the newly discovered material, and to determine independently whether a change in their individual score is appropriate.
6. **NO SCORE IS TO BE CHANGED SIMPLY BECAUSE IT DOES NOT AGREE WITH MOST OF THE OTHER SCORES GIVEN BY OTHER EVALUATORS.** To do so would be to exert undue influence upon the judgment of the evaluator -- a procedure that is to be avoided at any cost.
7. Once the scoring tabulation sheet is filled out and a score recorded for each criterion for each evaluator, the individual score sheets are collected and placed into the procurement file.
8. The individual scores are to be tabulated and averaged in the presence of at least one witness. After the witness has verified the calculations, the final score for each provider should be listed in rank order in the evaluation team's recommendation that will be submitted to the Coalition C.E.O. and the Board of Directors for review and for a final contract award decision.
9. All Evaluators must write their names on their proposals (both hard copy and thumb/flash drive, if possible), sign and date the last page of their score sheets (in ink), and return the proposals and scored sheets to the Coalition for the procurement records.

V. Conflict of Interest Forms

Early Learning Coalition of North Florida, Inc. Conflict of Interest Declaration

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a rater for the Early Learning Coalition of North Florida's Request for Qualifications for External Auditing Services. Below are the firms that have submitted proposals:

James Moore & Co., P.L.
Moss, Krusick & Associates, LLC

By signing below you are certifying that:

1. You have no material financial interest in any of the firms listed, nor do any of your immediate family members. Material financial interest is defined as the actual or perceived receipt of monetary benefit resulting from an award of a contract to one or more of the firms listed;
2. Neither you nor any of your immediate family members serve in a leadership position with any of the firms listed. A leadership position is defined as serving as an employee, board member or other similar position of influence for one or more of the firms listed; and,
3. That to the best of your knowledge you have no conflict of interest that would preclude you from fairly and objectively reviewing, assessing, and comparing the merits of the proposals submitted by the firms.

Printed Name

Date

Signature

VI. Establish RFQ Committee Chair Person (and secondary) to present recommendation to Board

VII. Committee Members Questions

VIII. Calculation and Verification of Final Scores

Evaluation Score Sheet Tabulations
 Early Learning Coalition of North Florida, Inc.
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR EXTERNAL AUDITING SERVICES No. 2022-01
 May 11, 2022

Agency Name (of Responder): NAME OF CPA FIRM

Evaluator⇒ Criteria (and maximum score possible) ↓	Evaluator's Name:	Evaluator's Name:	Evaluator's Name:	Evaluator's Name:	Totals (for each section and the Final Total Score)	Average Scores (total scores divided by number of evaluators)
Technical Requirements (100)						
A: Approach to the engagement (10)						
B: Firm profile and qualifications (20)						
C. Audit team members profile and qualifications (15)						
D. Cost of services (15)						
E. Prior not-for-profit and governmental auditing experience (15)						
F. At least two years Florida Early Learning Coalition auditing experience (25)						
Total Score for each evaluator	(max poss. score = 200)	(max poss. score = 200)	(max poss. score = 200)	(max poss. score = 200)	Final Total Score	Averaged Total Score

Witness: _____ Date: _____

Witness: _____ Date: _____

Procurement Manager confirmed that no one has tried to influence any of the evaluators and that they have exercised their own independent judgment in scoring each response independently of any other.

Procurement Manager Signature: _____ Date: _____

IX. Ranking of Proposals

X. Committee Discussion and Final Recommendation

XI. Adjournment