

Project - Dental Administrative Services / Interview Scoring

Firm Name: Cigna			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Plan of Action	35.00	5.00	175.00
Cost Effectiveness/Price Value	35.00	5.00	175.00
Qualifications / Experience	20.00	4.17	83.33
Reference List of Governmental Clients	10.00	4.00	40.00
Final Score			473.33
Max Score = 500			

Firm Name: Delta Dental			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Plan of Action	35.00	5.00	175.00
Cost Effectiveness/Price Value	35.00	3.00	105.00
Qualifications / Experience	20.00	3.67	73.33
Reference List of Governmental Clients	10.00	5.00	50.00
Final Score			403.33
Max Score = 500			

Firm Name: BCBS			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Plan of Action	35.00	3.67	128.33
Cost Effectiveness/Price Value	35.00	2.00	70.00
Qualifications / Experience	20.00	3.33	66.67
Reference List of Governmental Clients	10.00	2.00	20.00
Final Score			285.00
Max Score = 500			

Business Name: Aetna (not interviewed)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Plan of Action	35.00	0.00	0.00
Cost Effectiveness/Price Value	35.00	0.00	0.00
Qualifications / Experience	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Governmental Clients	10.00	0.00	0.00
Final Score			0.00
Max Score = 500			

Firm Name: MetLife (not interviewed)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Plan of Action	35.00	0.00	0.00
Cost Effectiveness/Price Value	35.00	0.00	0.00
Qualifications / Experience	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Governmental Clients	10.00	0.00	0.00
Final Score			0.00
Max Score = 500			

Plan of Action		Cost Effectiveness/Price Value		Relevant Qualifications/Experiences		Reference List of Governmental Clients	
Response	Points	Response	Points	Qualifications	Points	Reference List of Governmental Clients	Points
Member satisfaction; member support and communication; claims processing; customer complaint rates; responsiveness and availability; compliance and reputation. All above state benchmarks covered	5	Least cost compared to all other proposers	5	Superior: The firm's qualifications are superior, demonstrating their specialization in this field with at least 5 similar and verifiable projects in size and scope, and meeting all experience-based requirements.	5	Provided 5 verifiable references	5
At least 4 of the above benchmarks covered	4	2nd least cost	4	Above average: The qualifications of the firm are solid, demonstrating their expertise with at least 4 similar and verifiable projects in size and scope, and meeting most experience-based requirements.	4	Provided 4 verifiable references	4
At least 3 of the above benchmarks covered	3	3rd least cost	3	Average: The firm's qualifications are solid, demonstrating their specialization in this field with at least 3 similar and varied projects in size and scope, and meeting experience-based requirements.	3	Provided at least 3 verifiable references	3
At least 2 of the above benchmarks covered	2	4th least cost	2	Below Average: The firm's qualifications indicate that they have some experience in the field and/or less than 2 projects that are similar in nature & size and satisfy fewer experience-based requirements	2	Provided less than 3 (three) verifiable references	0
1 benchmark covered	1	5th least cost	1	Poor: The firm did not provide sufficient evidence of their qualifications for our project, including less than 1 verifiable project of similar nature and size, and they do not meet the required experience.	1		
No benchmarks covered	0	6th least cost	0				

Project - Medical Services / Interview Scoring

Firm Name: Cigna			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Plan of Action	35.00	4.83	169.17
Cost Effectiveness/Price Value	35.00	5.00	175.00
Qualifications / Experience	20.00	4.50	90.00
Reference list of Governmental Clients	10.00	3.00	30.00
Final Score			464
Max Score = 500			

Firm Name: BCBS			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
Plan of Action	35.00	4.67	163.33
Cost Effectiveness/Price Value	35.00	4.00	140.00
Qualifications / Experience	20.00	3.67	73.33
Reference list of Governmental Clients	10.00	2.00	20.00
Final Score			397
Max Score = 500			

Plan of Action		Cost Effectiveness/Price Value		Relevant Qualifications/Experiences		Reference list of Governmental Clients	
Response	Points	Response	Points	Qualifications	Points	Reference list of Governmental Clients	Points
Member satisfaction; member support and communication; claims processing; customer complaint rates; responsiveness and availability; compliance and reputation. All above stated benchmarks covered	5	Least cost compared to all other proposers	5	Superior: The firm's qualifications are superior, demonstrating their specialization in this field with at least 5 similar and verifiable projects in size and scope, and meeting all experience-based requirements.	5	Provided 5 verifiable references	5
At least 4 of the above benchmarks covered	4	2nd least cost	4	Above average: The qualifications of the firm are solid, demonstrating their expertise with at least 4 similar and verifiable projects in size and scope, and meeting most experience-based requirements.	4	Provided 4 verifiable references	4
At least 3 of the above benchmarks covered	3	3rd least cost	3	Average: The firm's qualifications are solid, demonstrating their specialization in this field with at least 3 similar and varied projects in size and scope, and meeting experience-based requirements.	3	Provided at least 3 verifiable references	3
At least 2 of the above benchmarks covered	2	4th least cost	2	Below Average: The firm's qualifications indicate that they have some experience in the field and/or less than 2 projects that are similar in nature & size and satisfy fewer experience-based requirements	2	Provided less than 3 verifiable references	0
1 benchmark covered	1	5th least cost	1	Poor: The firm did not provide sufficient evidence of their qualifications for our project, including less than 1 verifiable project of similar nature and size, and they do not meet the required experience.	1		
No benchmarks covered	0	6th least cost	0				