



Procurement Training Question and Answers July 25-26, 2019

1. Are we supposed to submit background check forms or does Procurement when 1st phase of approval occurs?

It is the responsibility of the program office/schools to make certain the Background Check Form is completed by Human Resources and include in the contract packet submitted to the Office of Procurement for processing.

2. If we/MSA also have to do finger printing, do we do the background check form as well?

Special Schools have processes in place to ensure each campus worker is finger printed before work begins on campus. The Fingerprint Form can be used in the same way as the Background Check Form. If fingerprinting is done by special schools, the Background Check Form is not required. However, the school is responsible for ensuring the workers have been properly screened as required by law and shall include a copy in the contract packet for the procurement file.

***Teachers and other school personnel shall be subject to criminal history record checks and fingerprinting requirements applicable to other public schools under Section 37-9-17(2) and (3) .*

3. If there is no change in the methodology, are we still required to take them to the board?

Yes, a methodology for use to award a grant is limited to (5) five years and requires the same methodology to be presented to the board for approval to extend beyond that period.

4. If there is a change to the RFP during the Pre-Conference, will it restart the approval process? What is considered a significant change?

No, the change will not restart the approval process, however, it may extend the original due date of the process pending the depth of the amendment.

Amendments that affect the scope of service, schedule of deliverables, opening date, and/or correct defects or ambiguities are considered a significant change and must be re-posted as Amendment 1 and require a due date extension. One must consider, the

amendment may provide additional information to a prospective offeror who did not apply initially that may respond due to the new information.

The Questions and Answer document is useful for insignificant changes, such as clarifying language to the RFP.

5. The evaluation process should be revisited. It is very difficult to compose a balanced team with the RFA process and finding MDE personnel to be away from their desk for multiple days.

The Office of Procurement is available to assist the awarding offices with the selection of the evaluation committee using qualified internal and external evaluators who have knowledge or expertise of the RFA requirements. Evaluation committee membership obligates an individual to a commitment of independent judgment as well as time. Evaluators are morally bound to be as objective and fair as possible. In addition, a commitment of their time must be a priority, since timely awards are critical.

6. The conflict of interest timeline should reflect an amount of time. For example, a person should not be disqualified because they worked for JPS 20 years ago.

The Conflict of Interest Form has been updated to read: "I understand that no evaluator will be allowed to rate a proposal submitted by an entity where they or a relative currently are or previously were employed for a time period of at least ten (10) years since the employment. A relative is defined as a spouse, child, child's spouse, parent, parent's spouse, sibling, sibling's spouse, grandparent and grandparent spouse."

7. During the review process with other states, evaluators are allowed to discuss proposals to ensure consistency in scoring. For example, an evaluator may miss something (service to EL students) but if they can ask the question another team member could re-direct them to the appropriate section. Also, this won't make us look bad if comments are required.

Evaluators must have the skill-set and are responsible for reviewing and rating each response in an objective manner and with utmost integrity. Team discussions are encouraged to ensure offerors are scored in a fair, equitable, and transparent manner.

Please review the Evaluator's Guidelines for a listing of reviewer expectations during reviews.