

Overview of Competitive Contract Expansion (CCE) Evaluation Process

For the AHCCCS Complete Care-Regional Behavioral Health Agreement (ACC-RBHA) Competitive Contract Extension (CCE) YH20-0002, AHCCCS will use a scoring methodology of Consensus Evaluation and Ranking of Past Performance measures comprised of:

- Narrative Submissions
- Capitation Agreement/Administrative Cost Bid Signed
 - Agreement accepting capitation rates
 - Administrative Cost Bid Submission workbook
 - Actuarial Certification(s)
- Past Performance
 - ACC Past Performance
 - RBHA Past Performance

The B1 Narrative Submission will not be scored.

Consensus Evaluation

The general steps in the consensus evaluation process are described below:

Each Narrative Submission and Capitation Agreement/Administrative Cost Bid requirement will be evaluated by an Evaluation Team consisting of a maximum of three individuals. These individuals are referred to as team members. An external facilitator will be assigned to each Team to assist the Team in discussions of the submission requirement and to assist the Team in reaching consensus. Each team member will first individually evaluate the Offeror's response to the designated Narrative Submission or Capitation Agreement/Administrative Cost Bid. All team members will then be convened to participate in a consensus evaluation meeting(s) for the submission requirement, led by the Facilitator. Through the consensus evaluation meeting(s), the Team will establish a consensus ranking for each submission requirement which is approved by each member of the Team and incorporated into a consensus ranking document. The consensus ranking documents represent the rank of each submission requirement for each Offeror. Once the consensus ranking documents are completed, they will be submitted to the Finance Team for inclusion in the overall scoring methodology. A Consensus Rationale document will also be completed which specifies the ranking of each Offeror and reason(s) for the ranking of each submission requirement. All working documents used in the evaluation process will be destroyed.

During the consensus evaluation process, team members shall only consider the information submitted by the Offeror for the specific submission requirement. Information that is not received as part of the Offeror's bid submission for that specific requirement shall not be considered. When reviewing a specific response to an individual submission requirement, team members will not consider information that is outside the allotted page limit and permitted attachments and any information elsewhere in the Proposal. A policy, brochure, or reference to a policy or manual does not constitute an adequate response and will not be given any weight during the scoring evaluation process. An Offeror's use of contingent language such as "exploring" or "taking under consideration" will not be given any weight during the scoring evaluation process.

Ranking of Past Performance

Each Past Performance measure will be evaluated by a CCE Past Performance Evaluation Team consisting of two individuals. These individuals are referred to as team members.

One team member will first individually collect and enter the Offeror's data for each Past Performance measure and the second individual will review and check the data entered. Each Past Performance measure along with the Offerors results will be entered into the CCE Past Performance Tool by the CCE Past Performance Evaluation Team and separately ranked for ACC Past Performance and RBHA Past Performance for each Offeror. The CCE Past Performance Evaluation Team will incorporate ranks by past performance measure into a ranking document that will be submitted to the Finance Team for inclusion in the overall scoring methodology.