Chapter 7
Short List Evaluations (Interviews and Proposals)
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Section 1

Overview

Short List Meeting

If the managing office determines it will hold a Short List Meeting, notify the Short List firms and let them know when and where to meet. Inform the firms that attendance is mandatory and that providers who do not attend will not be eligible to submit a proposal or participate in an interview.

Providers who advance to the Short List must submit a proposal for evaluation or conduct an interview for evaluation, or do both (this information is stated in the NOI). Providers receive documents that include the criteria used for evaluations and further instructions. The CST evaluates and scores the provider. The provider(s) with the highest score(s) are selected and advance to negotiations.

This chapter includes the following:

- required interview
- required proposals
- required proposals and interviews

Application Regarding Selection Processes

Chapter 3, Determining a Selection Process and Administrative Qualifications, addresses the four available selection processes: standard, federal, small contract, and emergency.

Policies and procedures in this chapter apply to both the standard and federal selection processes. The small contract process does not include short-list evaluations. See Chapter 3, Section 3, Small Contract Process, for more information.

Emergency contract process procedures are expedited, and bypass most guidelines presented in this manual. See Chapter 3, Section 4, Emergency Process, for details.

Related Resources

- Contracting Process Time Frames for Engineering, Architecture, and Survey Contracts
- Professional Services Contract Selection and Award Process Flowchart
- Roles and Responsibilities Table
- Contracting for EAS Services: Contract Development and Negotiations
Section 2 — Required Interviews

If the NOI indicates that interviews are required, the Managing Office issues the Interview and Contract Guide (ICG) template, and interviews are held. The CST evaluates and scores the interviews. The ICG addresses how the interviews are to be conducted.

This section includes the following:

- IGC issuance, contents, and forms
- interview attendance
- recording or passively observing interviews
- telephone interviews
- interview screening
- conducting the interview
- overview of interview evaluations
- interview evaluation criteria
- workflows and forms used in interview evaluations
- individual or team evaluations
- provider selection

The ICG tells Short List providers the date, time, and location of the interview, along with what information and forms are to be brought to the interview.

IGC Issuance, Contents, and Forms

Prior to issuance, the CST Chair modifies the ICG template to accommodate the specific project, per its highlighted instructions. Additions, deletions, or revisions to the standard language in the template must be approved by DES-CCO. Any non-approved changes are reverted to the standard language.

The TxDOT project manager must address any issues that affect the ICG, interview, and utilization of the contract.

It is important that staff involved in the evaluation of interview be familiar with the content and instructions in the ICG.

ICG contents. The ICG includes tells Short List providers the following:
- date, time, location, and length of the interview, and items on the agenda along with what information and
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♦ attendance requirements
♦ insurance requirements
♦ evaluation criteria and associated weights (see Interview Evaluation Criteria, below)
♦ interview format, including the following options:
  • presentation only
  • question and answer only
  • presentation plus question and answer
  • another format
    Note: See a table entitled Guidance On Interview Format Options for detailed information.
♦ organizational chart providers bring to the interview
♦ list of forms providers complete and bring are to be brought to the interview, including
  • CCO-16 Debarment Certification - Architectural, Engineering and Surveying ("Provider") Contracts
  • CCO-17 Lower Tier Participant Debarment Certification (Architectural, Engineering and Surveying Contracts)
  • CCO-19 Audit Contact List for Project Team
  • Lobbying Certification for Grants, Contracts, Loans and Interagency Cooperation Contracts
  • CCO-22 Availability and Commitment of Key Staff
    Note: The top four forms will be important if the provider is selected and negotiates a contract. The CCO-22, however, will be used to the evaluation the provider’s their ability to meet the project schedule.

Note. See the ICG template and forms for full instructions. Always access forms from the provided links or from the DES-CCO website to ensure the latest versions are used.

It is important that staff involved in the evaluation of interview be familiar with the content and instructions in the ICG.

Interview Format Options.

A managing office has some format options for the interview process. A table entitled Guidance On Interview Format Options is available on the . The table outlines the different components of the basic options. A question and answer component is required in every interview.

Telephone interviews are an option as long as all interviews with all providers are of the same type. Telephone interviews are not appropriate for complex or non-standard projects such as major corridor projects, exotic bridge design, etc.
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Conducting the Interview Attendance

Matt: You stated you’d develop this subsection a bit.

Interview attendance requirements vary and are included in the NOI’s instructions.

Recording or Passively Observing Interviews

The audio or video recordings of interviews by the CST or the provider by the consultant is strictly prohibited not permitted. There are a number of potential issues associated with the making of recordings, some relatively minor, some potentially serious. To minimize the risks associated with these issues, the making of audio or video recordings of the interview are not permitted.

Observing an interview for training purposes is also prohibited, to avoid potential not to be considered as a training opportunity for future CST members. During the interview, the attention of the team must be focused on the information being conveyed, without the distractions of an observing trainee. Training for future CST members receive training by is to be accomplished by participation in the attending required TxDOT contracting classes and by seeking coaching by the CST chair, and other Managing Office personnel. experience gained through participation in the process as a CST member.

Telephone Interviews

Matt: You’re verifying this subsection

Telephone interviews are permitted an option as long as long as all interviews with all providers are conducted on the telephone of the same type. Telephone interviews however, are not inappropriate for complex or non-standard projects such as major corridor projects, exotic bridge design, etc. As with all interview formats, interviews by telephone must be specified in the ICG.

Interview Screening

Prior to the beginning of the interview, the CST Chair screens the provider by collecting the forms specified in the ICG, and verifying that each form is completed. Forms include the following:

- CCO-16
- CCO-17
- CCO-19
- Lobbying Certification
- CCO-22
Providers who fail screening are not interviewed and receive a score of zero. CCO-16 Debarment Certification - Architectural, Engineering and Surveying (“Provider”) Contracts

- CCO-17 Lower Tier Participant Debarment Certification (Architectural, Engineering and Surveying Contracts)
- CCO-19 Audit Contact List for Project Team
- Lobbying Certification for Grants, Contracts, Loans and Interagency Cooperation Contracts
- CCO-22 Availability and Commitment of Key Staff

Conducting the Interview

The CST Chair conducts the interview, and designates the roles of other CST members. The Chair uses a pre-prepared outline and format that guides the interview, which is previously discussed with team members.

During the interview, the Chair does the following:
- introduces the CST members
- reviews the interview format with the provider
- identifies and discusses the guidelines and restrictions
- explains the Q&A process and who may answer
- emphasizes time restrictions and maintains a clock in clear view (time management is the responsibility of the provider)
- ensures all guidelines and restrictions are applied consistently

Overview of Interview Evaluations

Interviews that pass screening are evaluated by the CST. ICGs contain standard content regarding a provider’s experience and expertise that serves as the core of these evaluations; the CST develops related content that the team uses to specifically evaluate and score proposals.

Subsequent subsections in this section discuss how this content is created and used to evaluate and score a provider’s proposal.

Interview Evaluation Criteria

All ICGs contain the following basic criteria and weighting, which constitute the core of proposal evaluations, were developed and published in the... The RFP template includes the following standard criteria.
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- understanding of scope of services (XX%)
- experience of the project manager and the project team (XX%)
- ability to meet the project schedule (XX%)
- prime provider’s Quality Assurance/Quality Control program (If this criterion was not included in the NOI, it must be evaluated in the proposal.) (XX%)
- prime provider past performance scores in the CCIS database for department contracts reflecting less than satisfactory performance (XX%)
- other qualifications-based criteria approved by DES-CCO included in the RFP. (XX%)

For each standard criterion, the CST Chair—with the support of CST members and SMEs outside the team—develops the Short List evaluation worksheet. The worksheet contains the scoring methodology for the evaluation criteria. Each evaluation criteria includes detailed sub-criteria by which to allocate points.

The questions must be qualifications-based with an emphasis on the technical aspects of the work anticipated. All providers are asked the same questions, but the CST may ask follow-up questions to clarify a provider’s response. Interview records must include these follow-up questions.

See LINK Sample Interview Evaluation Worksheet Listing Criteria and Sub-Criteria.

Matt2: the below subsection varies a bit from the last edit

Workflows and Forms Used in Interview Evaluations

See Chapter 9, Workflows and Forms Used in Provider Evaluations, for guidelines regarding workflows and forms used to document interview evaluations.

Care should be given not to bias the process towards providers with previous TxDOT experience. A provider with no TxDOT experience should have a fair opportunity to be evaluated based on technical qualifications and not on knowledge of internal processes, forms, and procedures that only firms with previous TxDOT contracts would have experience with. It is the responsibility of each CST member and Contract Office Manager to ensure that evaluation criteria and the scoring methodology is fair and applicable to the work anticipated.

It is the responsibility of the CST Chair to explain and ensure that all CST members understand how the criteria is to be applied and how the scores are to be documented and maintained for ultimate completion of the CCO-10 prior to beginning evaluation. The intent is to have a common understanding of the criteria and process of evaluation to avoid extreme application and skewed results.

DES-CCO has developed a sample scoring matrix format for use evaluating interviews. This matrix or something similar should be used to document the questions and scoring methodology for evaluating each interview.

Matt2: the below subsection varies a bit from the last edit

Workflows and Forms Used in Interview Evaluations

See Chapter 9, Workflows and Forms Used in Provider Evaluations, for guidelines regarding workflows and forms used to document interview evaluations.

Care should be given not to bias the process towards providers with previous TxDOT experience. A provider with no TxDOT experience should have a fair opportunity to be evaluated based on technical qualifications and not on knowledge of internal processes, forms, and procedures that only firms with previous TxDOT contracts would have experience with. It is the responsibility of each CST member and Contract Office Manager to ensure that evaluation criteria and the scoring methodology is fair and applicable to the work anticipated.

It is the responsibility of the CST Chair to explain and ensure that all CST members understand how the criteria is to be applied and how the scores are to be documented and maintained for ultimate completion of the CCO-10 prior to beginning evaluation. The intent is to have a common understanding of the criteria and process of evaluation to avoid extreme application and skewed results.

DES-CCO has developed a sample scoring matrix format for use evaluating interviews. This matrix or something similar should be used to document the questions and scoring methodology for evaluating each interview.
All providers are asked the same questions, but a provider may be asked follow-up questions if the team needs clarification of the provider’s response. If follow-up questions are asked, they must be recorded in the interview records.

### Interview Screening

**Issuing an ICG to Initiate an Interview**

- CCO-16 Debarment Certification—Architectural, Engineering and Surveying ("Provider") Contracts
- CCO-17 Lower Tier Participant Debarment Certification (Architectural, Engineering and Surveying Contracts)
- CCO-19 Audit Contact List for Project Team
- Lobbying Certification for Grants, Contracts, Loans and Interagency Cooperation Contracts
- CCO-22 Availability and Commitment of Key Staff

### Conducting the Interview

A Consultant Selection Team member must be present to evaluate a provider.

A prime provider’s project manager is required to attend to conduct the interview for the provider. If the project manager does not attend, the provider will be disqualified from further participation in the procurement process.

If authorized in the Interview and Contract Guide, subproviders may attend the interview and present their qualifications and proposed contributions to the project. The CST may further limit attendance at the interview to a reasonable number.

In the case where a firm is on multiple short listed teams, such as firms flip-flopping the prime/subprovider roles, the same person from the firm must not participate in more than one interview. The firm must be represented by a separate person at each interview.

The CST may further limit attendance at the interview to a reasonable number.

### Subproviders

If authorized in the Interview and Contract Guide, subproviders may attend the interview and present their qualifications and proposed contributions to the project.
The recording of interviews by the CST or by the consultant is not permitted. There are a number of potential issues associated with the making of recordings, some relatively minor, some potentially serious. To minimize the risks associated with these issues, the making of audio or video recordings of the interview are not permitted.

Observing an interview is not to be considered as a training opportunity for future CST members. During the interview, the attention of the team must be focused on the information being conveyed, without the distraction of an observing trainee. Training for future CST members is to be accomplished by participation in the required TxDOT contracting class, coaching by the CST chair, and experience gained through participation in the process as a CST member.

Note: The paragraph below I believe is adequately discussed in IGC Contents atop the section.

The interview may include a presentation by the provider. However, depending upon the nature of the project, a Consultant Selection Team may decide that formal provider presentations are not needed. If the CST requires the provider to make a presentation, the provider’s presentation must comply with the format, length, number of participants, etc., established in the ICG.

It is the responsibility of each CST member to listen and evaluate each interview according to the criteria developed for the process. It is also the responsibility of each CST member to properly and legibly document their scores on the Interview Evaluation Worksheet, so the individual responsible for completing the CCO-10 Interview Evaluation Form can clearly understand and check the scoring process.

**Individual or Team Evaluations**

**Interview Scoring** Each CST team member will evaluate and score each interview. Joint evaluations are not permitted.

CST members use their professional judgment to assess a team’s knowledge, experience, skills, and qualifications. The worksheet, detailing evaluation criteria, sub-criteria and scoring methodology is used to document the evaluation and scoring of each interview. The scores from the worksheet are transferred to the CCO-10 form. All information related to each step of the process is subject to open records requests. Each person involved has the responsibility of maintaining unquestionable documentation that clearly supports a fair process. This information can also help to provide a more effective debrief.

Refer to the section on “Checking Past Performance/References” for an explanation of how to address the criteria (past performance scores in CCIS or references) for the short listed firms.
Provider Selection

Interview Evaluation Scores Summary

The scores from the CCO-10 forms are summarized on the CCO-11 Interview Evaluation Summary Form. The provider(s) with the highest score(s) are selected and advance to negotiations. The CST Chair is responsible for verifying that the summary is correct. If scores appear to be significantly skewed, the CST Chair should review the evaluations to insure the instructions were clearly understood and the process was conducted fairly. One member may score harsher than another, but as long as they are consistent in their application, the results should not be affected.

If proposals are not required, the highest score(s) reflect the firms that will be selected for the contract(s).

For next steps, see Chapter 8, Finalizing the Selection Process and Consent to Negotiate.
Section 3

Required Proposals

Overview

If the NOI designates that managing office requires written proposals are required, the Managing Office issues providers a Request for Proposals (RFP) is issued, and proposals are received and evaluated. The RFP addresses how the proposal is to be prepared and tells Short List providers what to include in a written proposal and how to submit it to the CST consultant Selection Team.

This section includes the following:
- RFP issuance, contents, and forms
- Receiving proposals
- Proposal screening
- Overview of proposal evaluations
- Proposal evaluation criteria
- Workflows and forms used for proposal evaluations
- Individual or team evaluations
- Provider selection

Request for Proposals (RFP Issuance, Contents, and Forms)

Prior to issuance, the CST Chair manages the office modifies the RFP template to accommodate the must use the appropriate RFP template, inserting the appropriate information specific project, per its into the highlighted areas and deleting highlighted instructions. Other additions, deletions, or revisions to the standard language in the template must be coordinated approved by with DES-CCO. The RFP template provided is set up for use assuming interviews will not be conducted. Any non-approved changes are reverted to the standard language.

If the managing office requires both a written proposal and an interview, the ICG/RFP template combines the requirements of the RFP and ICG into one document. Many of the requirements of the ICG are incorporated into the RFP since the proposals will be submitted prior to conducting interviews. The RFP/ICG is addressed later in this section. The TxDOT project manager must PM should develop the scope of work, criteria weighting, and address any issues other key decisions that affect the RFP, proposal, and utilization of the future contract.

It is important that staff involved in the screening and evaluation of proposals be familiar with the content and instructions in the RFP.
RFP Contents. RFP contents include the following:

- proposal format
- evaluation criteria with associated weights (see Proposal Evaluation Criteria, below)
- whether a mandatory meeting is required, and if so, its time and location
- insurance requirements
- organizational chart submitted with the proposal
- list of forms providers submit with the proposal, including the following:
  - CCO-16 Debarment Certification - Architectural, Engineering and Surveying ("Provider") Contracts
  - CCO-17 Lower Tier Participant Debarment Certification - Architectural, Engineering and Surveying Contracts
  - CCO-19 Audit Contact List for Project Team
  - Lobbying Certification for Grants, Contracts, Loans and Interagency Cooperation Contracts
  - CCO-22 Availability and Commitment of Key Staff

Note: Is there a link to the Lobbying form?

The top four forms will be important if the provider is selected and negotiates a contract. The CCO-22, however, will be used to evaluate a provider’s ability to meet the project schedule.

Note. See the RFP template and forms for full instructions. Always access forms from the provided links or from the DES-CCO website to ensure the latest versions are used.

Receiving Proposals

Note. Prior to receiving proposals, the CST develops the content used for their evaluation and scoring. See Proposal Evaluations, below.

Proper handling and management of the proposals received is critical importance. The Managing Office must have a plan in place and staff designated with the responsibility to handle with the incoming submissions.

The Managing Office coordinates with the mailroom or other staff responsible for receiving mail to advise that contract proposals are being mailed to TxDOT. As the proposals are received, the Managing Office must

Matt: Below, please verify that a “proposal receipt log” exists

- stamp each envelope or package upon receipt, recording the official date and time the proposal is received;
complete the [LINK Proposal Receipt Log](#), recording the official date and time each proposal is received and the mode of delivery (hand, standard mail, or express mail) for each proposal, as well as the total number of proposals received; and

- maintain the proposals in a secure location, such as a locked file cabinet.

### Proposal Screening

The CST screens proposals according to the RFP to determine whether the proposal was developed in accordance with the instructions in the RFP and to verify that the required forms were submitted. Refer to the [example format](#) for developing a RFP screening checklist. Proposals that fail screening are not prepared according to the instructions and should not be evaluated or considered further and are given a score of zero.

As indicated in the RFP, the following five forms must be submitted with each proposal:

- CCO-16 Debarment Certification - Architectural, Engineering and Surveying (“Provider”) Contracts
- CCO-17 Lower Tier Participant Debarment Certification (Architectural, Engineering and Surveying Contracts)
- CCO-19 Audit Contact List for Project Team
- Lobbying Certification for Grants, Contracts, Loans and Interagency Cooperation Contracts
- CCO-22 Availability and Commitment of Key Staff

The top four forms will be important if the provider is selected and negotiates a contract. The CCO-22, however, will be used in the evaluation of their ability to meet the project schedule.

### Overview of Proposal Evaluations

Proposals that pass screening are evaluated by the CST. RFPs contain standard content regarding a provider’s experience and expertise that serves as the core of these evaluations; the CST develops related content that the team uses to specifically evaluate and score proposals.

Subsequent subsections in this section discuss how this content is created and used to evaluate and score a provider’s proposal.

### Proposal Evaluation Criteria

All RFPs contain the following basic criteria and weighting, which constitute the core of proposal evaluations:

- [example format](#) for developing a RFP screening checklist.
Chapter 7 — Short List Evaluations (Interviews and Proposals)

Section 3 — Required Proposals

- understanding of scope of services (XX%)
- experience of the project manager and the project team (XX%)
- ability to meet the project schedule (XX%)
- prime provider’s Quality Assurance/Quality Control program (If this criterion was not included in the NOI, it must be evaluated in the proposal.) (XX%)
- prime provider past performance scores in the CCIS database for department contracts reflecting less than satisfactory performance (XX%)
- other qualifications-based criteria approved by DES-CCO included in the RFP. (XX%)

For each standard criterion, the CST Chair—with the support of CST members and SMEs outside the team—develops the Short List evaluation worksheet. The worksheet contains the scoring methodology for the evaluation criteria. Each evaluation criteria includes detailed sub-criteria by which to allocate points.

The sub-criteria must be qualifications-based with an emphasis on the technical aspects of the work anticipated.

See LINK Sample Proposal Evaluation Worksheet with Criteria and Sub-Criteria.

Matt2: the below subsection varies a bit from the last edit

Workflows and Forms Used in Proposal Evaluations

See Chapter 9, Workflows and Forms Used in Provider Evaluations, for guidelines regarding workflows and forms used to document proposal evaluations.

Care should be given not to bias the process towards providers with previous TxDOT experience. A provider with no TxDOT experience should have a fair opportunity to be evaluated based on technical qualifications and not on knowledge of internal processes, forms, and procedures that only firms with previous TxDOT contracts would have experience with. It is the responsibility of each CST member and Contract Office Manager to ensure that evaluation criteria and the scoring methodology is fair and applicable to the work anticipated.

It is the responsibility of the CST Chair to explain and ensure that all CST members understand how the criteria is to be applied and how the scores are to be documented and maintained for ultimate completion of the CCO-8 prior to beginning evaluation. The intent is to have a common understanding of the criteria and process of evaluation to avoid extreme application and skewed results.

DES-CCO has developed a sample scoring matrix format for use evaluating proposals. This matrix or something similar should be used to document the sub-criteria and scoring methodology for evaluating each proposal.
Proper handling and management of the proposals received is importance. The managing office must have a plan in place and staff designated with the responsibility to deal with the incoming submissions.

The managing office coordinates with the mailroom or other staff responsible for receiving mail to advise that contract proposals are being mailed to TxDOT. The managing office is responsible for taking the following actions when proposals are received:

- recording the date and time received (mailroom stamps are preferred)
- recording the mode of delivery (hand, US Mail, overnight) and the number of proposals received
- maintaining proposals in a secure limited access location until the closing date

Screen proposals according to the RFP to determine if the proposal was developed according to the instructions in the RFP. Refer to the as example format for developing a RFP screening checklist. Proposals that are not prepared according to the instructions should not be evaluated and given a score of zero.

As indicated in the RFP, the following five forms must be submitted with each proposal:

- CCO-16 Debarment Certification – Architectural, Engineering and Surveying (“Provider”) Contracts
- CCO-17 Lower Tier Participant Debarment Certification (Architectural, Engineering and Surveying Contracts)
- CCO-19 Audit Contact List for Project Team
- Lobbying Certification for Grants, Contracts, Loans and Interagency Cooperation Contracts
- CCO-22 Availability and Commitment of Key Staff

The top four forms will be important if the provider is selected and negotiates a contract. The CCO-22, however, will be used in the evaluation of their ability to meet the project schedule.

Evaluating Proposals
Individual or Team Evaluations

Matt: I inserted the below per your note, but I believe the training manual permits team evaluations for proposals (see 2nd highlighted paragraph). Can you verify?

Also, it should parallel wording in the Interview section. Please advise.
CST members evaluate proposals individually to avoid undue influence or other potential problems. Each team member completes an evaluation worksheet and a form CCO-8 for each proposal. Thus, for a CST consisting of five members who are evaluating a Long List of 30 proposal, 150 evaluation worksheets and 150 CCO-4 forms are generated.

It is the responsibility of each CST member to read and evaluate proposals individually, or as a team, each proposal according to the criteria developed for the respective process. It is also the responsibility of each CST member to properly and legibly document their scores on the Proposal Evaluation Worksheet, so that the individual responsible for completing the CCO-8 Proposal Evaluation form can clearly understand and check the scoring process.

**Proposal Scoring**

Each team member will prepare an evaluation worksheet to score the proposal. CST members use their professional judgment to assess a team’s understanding of the scope of services, ability to meet a project schedule, knowledge, experience, skills, and qualifications. Detailing evaluation criteria, sub-criteria and scoring methodology is used to document the evaluation and scoring of each proposal. The scores from the worksheet are transferred to the CCO-8 form. All information related to each step of the process is subject to open records requests. Each person involved has the responsibility of maintaining unquestionable documentation that clearly supports a fair process. This information can also help to provide a more effective debrief.

Note: the below is mentioned in Proposal Evaluation Criteria, above.

Refer to the section on “Checking Past Performance/References” for an explanation of how to address the criteria (past performance scores in CCIS or references) for the short listed firms.

**Proposal Evaluation Scores Summary Provider Selection**

The scores from the CCO-8 form are summarized on the CCO-9 Proposal Evaluation Summary. The provider(s) with the highest score(s) are selected and will advance to negotiations. The CST Chair is responsible for verifying that the summary is correct. If scores appear to be significantly skewed, the CST Chair should review the evaluations to insure the instructions were clearly understood and the process was conducted fairly. One member may score harsher than another, but as long as they are consistent in their application, the results should not be affected.

If interviews will not be conducted the highest score(s) reflect the firms that will be selected for the contract(s).

For next steps, see Chapter 8, Finalizing the Selection Process and Consent to Negotiate.
Section 4 — Required When Interviews and Proposals Are Conducted

Should the NOI designate that both an interview and proposal are required, providers are issued the ICG/RFP template that combines the requirements of both documents into one. Many of the requirements of the ICG are incorporated into the RFP, since proposals are submitted before interviews are conducted. As with other templates, the Managing Office modifies the RFP/ICG template to the specific contract, by inserting the appropriate information into the highlighted areas and deleting highlighted instructions. Other additions, deletions, or revisions to the standard language in the template must be coordinated with DES-CCO. Any non-approved changes are reverted to the standard language.

Otherwise, the evaluation processes discussed earlier in this chapter and in Chapter 9, Workflows and Forms Used for Provider Evaluations, apply for using proposals and interviews should be followed as covered previously in this section.

When doing both, the scores from the CCO-9 and CCO-11 are summarized on the CCO-12 Proposal and Interview Evaluation Summary.

Provider Selection

The provider(s) with the highest score(s) are selected and advance to negotiations. Scores for proposals and interviews may be weighted as the CST sees fit. A firm’s total score is a combination of their proposal and interview score. The proposal is 30% and the interview is 70% of the total score. The highest total score(s) reflect the firms that will be selected for the contract(s).

For next steps, see Chapter 8, Finalizing the Selection Process and Consent to Negotiate.

Evaluation of past performance scores or references is required for short listed providers. This criterion is evaluated one time and scores are included either on the CCO-8 or CCO-10. The primary purpose of this exercise is to collect information on the evaluation of the qualifications of primarily the proposed prime provider’s project manager and secondarily, the firm. According to the NOI instructions, each consultant must list three client references in their LOI. These references may be TxDOT or non-TxDOT client references.

For non-TxDOT references (identified in the LOI), the process requires the non-TxDOT reference to submit their information about the consultant on a form, the Past Performance Evaluation, which follows the same format as the TxDOT Prime Provider Evaluation form. It is the consultant’s responsibility to provide this form to the non-TxDOT reference. According to the instructions, the non-TxDOT reference must submit the form directly to the TxDOT contact information provided within the number of days indicated. CST members no longer have to contact these references.
For TxDOT database references (identified in the LOI), instructions to the consultants emphasize that the person should be an individual in a position to evaluate the qualifications of the proposed prime provider’s project manager. For example, the TxDOT project manager or someone with close oversight responsibilities. In other words, it should be someone that has or can complete the standard TxDOT Prime Provider Evaluation Form (CCO-15) for the proposed individual. The CST member, or supporting staff collecting the information, should access the CCIS database directly, according to available instructions. They should not contact the district reference. This is a waste of the district reference’s time if they have already posted their evaluations in CCIS. Use the database.

If an evaluation is not on file in the CCIS database, the identified TxDOT reference should be asked to complete one by the selection team staff collecting the reference information. If they are the PM, it should be input into CCIS. If they are not the PM, it should not be entered. So, use of a separate form or something different from the standard form is unnecessary.

In addition to references identified in the LOI, there may be additional TxDOT Prime Provider Evaluations input into CCIS by other TxDOT project managers as part of their project management responsibilities. There is no reason that all available past performance scores should not be looked up and considered in combination with the references identified in the LOI.

Use of the Past Performance Evaluation form by the consultants for non-TxDOT references and appropriate internal use of the TxDOT Prime Provider Evaluation Form (CCO-15) results in a more consistent approach for this step and reduces the motions required to obtain the information.

is available with some example sub-criteria for evaluating all references:

Can CST Members talk to Each Other?

Throughout the process there is nothing that restricts CST members from talking to each other about the content of the process. What should be avoided are situations where one or more members are applying an inappropriate level of influence over another member. Each member of the selection team has a responsibility for ensuring the process is being conducted fairly. If conduct of the CST chair is in question, the problem should be reported to a supervisory level that will allow the problem to be addressed.

Evaluate Only What’s Presented Within the Process
The competing providers have an opportunity to submit LOIs with a combination of proposals and interviews with evaluations and references. The CST members’ evaluation must be based solely on the information presented in the LOI, the proposal, the interview, and evaluations and references. CST members may have significant knowledge of the competing firms or employees through previous employment, previous TxDOT contracts, existing TxDOT contracts, or other means. This information cannot be used in evaluating a firm or individual if it is not presented within the process. It is the consultant’s responsibility to decide and provide the information to be evaluated. CST members’ use of information from outside the process as a basis for evaluation and assigning scores is inappropriate, unfair, and unacceptable.

**Project Manager and Task Leader Replacement**

The current process allows limited options for a consultant to replace a project manager or task leader during the selection process. There is specific language in the NOI (under Letter of Interest Requirements) that addresses the limited options. Please refer to the specific language.

The consultant may identify the need for a replacement during the LOI evaluation stage, the short list evaluation stage, or during negotiations. It is typically not advisable to “back up” in the process in order to address a change. It is best to continue forward with what was submitted and address the change at the next step in the process. Any replacement must come from the team identified in the LOI because there is no opportunity to provide any supplemental information to the LOI or a proposal after submittal. The information, as submitted, may or may not be enough for the consultant to receive a successful score, but that is the risk of a change in staff during a selection.

It is typically not advisable to “back up” in the process in order to address a change. It is best to continue forward with what was submitted and address the change at the next step in the process.

If TxDOT is notified of a change after selection, but before contract execution, the firm’s option for replacement is still subject to the personnel identified in the LOI which was subject to evaluation during the process. If the replacement is deemed unsatisfactory, TxDOT will go with the next qualified provider. After contract execution, the process is governed by the provisions in the contract regarding personnel.