

ATTACHMENT C

Proposal Evaluation and Scoring Tool

Internal Evaluation Worksheet - Specialized SMI Residential Services

Issued By	St. Clair County Community Mental Health Authority
RFP Number	01-FY2027
Issue Date	October 16, 2026
Proposal Due	December 16, 2026

Michigan Specialized Residential Services - Serious Mental Illness (SMI)

Respondent: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Phase I - Responsiveness Review

- ☐ Complete proposal received by deadline
- ☐ Mandatory Requirements Checklist completed
- ☐ Financial Proposal completed
- ☐ Staffing Plan submitted
- ☐ SMI training/competency plan submitted
- ☐ Implementation Plan submitted
- ☐ Required references provided
- ☐ Required certifications/documentation provided
- ☐ No material exceptions that render proposal non-responsive

Proceed to Scoring: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

Evaluator Scoring Instructions

Score each category using only information contained in the submitted proposal and permitted supporting documentation. Do not award points based on assumptions, prior knowledge of the respondent, or information not made available to all evaluators.

The point ranges below are intended to promote consistency. A response should receive the highest score within a range only when the evidence clearly supports that score. When less than the maximum available points are awarded, the evaluator should briefly document the material gap, weakness, risk, or missing detail in the Comments section.

Phase I responsiveness and mandatory requirements are threshold matters. A proposal determined non-responsive should not proceed to numerical scoring unless the procurement process specifically permits clarification or cure.

1. Experience and Organizational Qualifications - 20 Points

Evaluate:

- Experience serving adults with SMI and complex psychiatric needs
- Experience operating specialized residential programs
- Experience within Michigan's public behavioral health system
- AFC licensing/compliance history
- Leadership, financial, and administrative capacity
- References and demonstrated past performance

Category-Specific Scoring Guide

Rating	Points	Evaluator Standard
Excellent	20	Demonstrates extensive, directly relevant experience serving adults with SMI and complex psychiatric needs; strong specialized residential/AFC performance; substantial Michigan public behavioral health experience; capable leadership and administrative infrastructure; credible references; and no material capacity or compliance concerns.
Good	15-19	Fully demonstrates relevant SMI and residential experience, capable leadership, appropriate Michigan system knowledge, and generally strong past performance. Minor gaps in depth, specificity, or demonstrated experience do not materially affect expected performance.
Acceptable	10-14	Demonstrates adequate qualifications and general ability to perform, but experience or supporting evidence is limited in one or more important areas such as SMI specialization, AFC operations, Michigan public behavioral health, organizational capacity, or references.

Marginal	5-9	Partially demonstrates required qualifications. Proposal contains notable gaps, weak evidence of comparable experience, concerning performance history, limited organizational depth, or material capacity risks requiring substantial clarification or oversight.
Unacceptable	0-4	Fails to demonstrate sufficient relevant experience, organizational capacity, or past performance to reasonably support successful operation of the specialized SMI residential program, or presents significant unresolved compliance/capacity risk.

Score: _____ / 20

Comments:

2. Proposed Program and SMI Service Model - 20 Points

Evaluate:

- Understanding of target SMI population
- Recovery-oriented, person-centered, and trauma-informed approach
- Psychiatric symptom recognition and relapse prevention
- Psychosis, mood disorder, suicide-risk, and co-occurring substance use competency
- Hospitalization return and placement-stabilization approach
- Community integration and independence-building

Category-Specific Scoring Guide

Rating	Points	Evaluator Standard
Excellent	20	Presents a comprehensive, recovery-oriented, person-centered and trauma-informed SMI model with clear operational approaches to psychiatric symptom recognition, relapse prevention, psychosis/mood symptoms, suicide risk, co-occurring substance use, hospitalization return, placement preservation, community integration, and increasing independence.
Good	15-19	Presents a strong and appropriate SMI service model that fully addresses the major program expectations. Approach is specific and workable with only minor gaps in detail, integration, or implementation methodology.
Acceptable	10-14	Generally meets program expectations and demonstrates an adequate understanding of the SMI population, but important elements are described at a high level or lack sufficient detail regarding how the model will operate in practice.
Marginal	5-9	Addresses some required elements but demonstrates an incomplete or inconsistent SMI model, limited recovery/person-centered focus, weak crisis or relapse-prevention planning, or insufficient strategies for placement stability and community integration.
Unacceptable	0-4	Fails to present a viable specialized SMI service model or demonstrates an approach inconsistent with core recovery, person-centered, safety, stabilization, or community-based expectations.

Score: _____ / 20

Comments:

3. Staffing and Workforce Plan - 20 Points

Evaluate:

- Staffing ratios and coverage by shift
- Awake overnight model
- Supervisory and on-call structure

- SMI qualifications, training, and demonstrated competency
- Recruitment and retention strategy
- Call-off/vacancy/contingency plan
- Clinical consultation and staff continuity

Category-Specific Scoring Guide

Rating	Points	Evaluator Standard
Excellent	20	Provides a detailed and sustainable 24/7 staffing model with appropriate shift coverage and awake overnight support; clear supervision/on-call structure; strong SMI qualifications, training and competency validation; realistic recruitment and retention strategies; rapid call-off/vacancy coverage; appropriate clinical consultation; and strong continuity safeguards with minimal identified staffing risk.
Good	15-19	Provides a complete staffing model that appears capable of maintaining required coverage and competent SMI support. Recruitment, retention, supervision, training, contingency coverage and continuity plans are strong, with only minor gaps or manageable risks.
Acceptable	10-14	Staffing plan appears generally workable but contains moderate gaps or assumptions regarding ratios, overnight coverage, supervision, recruitment timelines, vacancy/call-off replacement, training competency, overtime/agency use, or clinical consultation.
Marginal	5-9	Staffing plan presents notable risks, including unclear coverage responsibility, weak recruitment/retention assumptions, excessive reliance on overtime or temporary staffing, inadequate SMI competency strategy, insufficient supervisory structure, or questionable contingency capacity.
Unacceptable	0-4	Does not demonstrate the ability to reliably maintain safe 24/7 staffing or adequately qualified/competent staff for the proposed SMI population, or otherwise presents significant unresolved workforce risk.

Score: _____ / 20

Comments:

4. Quality, Safety, and Clinical Coordination - 15 Points

Evaluate:

- Quality management and incident systems
- Recipient Rights protections
- Medication and psychiatric treatment coordination
- Crisis prevention, de-escalation, suicide-risk response
- Treatment-team communication
- Performance monitoring and corrective action

Category-Specific Scoring Guide

Rating	Points	Evaluator Standard
Excellent	15	Demonstrates integrated and mature quality, Recipient Rights, incident/risk management, medication coordination, psychiatric treatment coordination, crisis/de-escalation and suicide-risk response systems; strong treatment-team communication; meaningful performance monitoring; and timely corrective action processes.
Good	12-14	Fully addresses quality, safety, rights and clinical coordination requirements with strong systems and limited identified risk. Minor gaps are unlikely to materially affect performance.

Acceptable	8-11	Demonstrates adequate systems to meet requirements, but some processes are generic, insufficiently detailed, or dependent on clarification regarding accountability, communication, monitoring, or corrective action.
Marginal	4-7	Partially addresses requirements but presents notable gaps in Recipient Rights, medication/clinical coordination, crisis response, incident management, communication, quality monitoring, or corrective action.
Unacceptable	0-3	Fails to demonstrate adequate quality, safety, Recipient Rights, clinical coordination, crisis-response, or performance-management systems, or presents significant unresolved risk to individuals served.

Score: _____ / 15

Comments:

5. Implementation and Readiness - 10 Points

Evaluate:

- Proposed location and licensing status
- Facility readiness and accessibility
- Recruitment timeline
- Implementation schedule
- Identified risks and contingency plans

Category-Specific Scoring Guide

Rating	Points	Evaluator Standard
Excellent	10	Provides a highly credible and detailed implementation plan with an appropriate location/licensing path, facility readiness, realistic recruitment timeline, clear milestones, accountable leadership, and well-developed contingencies for identified start-up risks.
Good	8-9	Demonstrates strong readiness and a realistic implementation schedule. Key dependencies and risks are addressed, with only minor gaps unlikely to delay successful start-up.
Acceptable	5-7	Implementation appears feasible but contains moderate uncertainty or gaps regarding location, licensing, facility readiness, recruitment, timing, dependencies, or contingency planning.
Marginal	2-4	Implementation plan presents notable feasibility or timing concerns, significant unresolved dependencies, weak contingency planning, or insufficient evidence that the provider can be operational by the required start date.
Unacceptable	0-1	Does not demonstrate a credible pathway to implementation or presents substantial unresolved barriers to timely and compliant program start-up.

Score: _____ / 10

Comments:

6. Financial Proposal - 15 Points

Evaluate:

- Reasonableness and transparency of rate
- Staffing cost assumptions
- Administrative/overhead costs

- Occupancy and vacancy assumptions
- Enhanced staffing methodology
- Start-up funding
- Financial sustainability and overall value

Category-Specific Scoring Guide

Rating	Points	Evaluator Standard
Excellent	15	Pricing is complete, transparent, internally consistent and reasonable in relation to the proposed service model; assumptions for staffing, occupancy/vacancy, overhead, enhanced staffing and start-up costs are clearly explained; proposal demonstrates financial sustainability and strong overall value without material hidden cost risk.
Good	12-14	Pricing is reasonable and substantially transparent with sound assumptions and good overall value. Minor questions or negotiation items do not create material financial or operational risk.
Acceptable	8-11	Pricing is generally supportable but contains moderate gaps, unclear assumptions, limited transparency, or cost elements requiring clarification or negotiation. Overall value is acceptable but not clearly advantageous.
Marginal	4-7	Financial proposal contains significant uncertainty, questionable assumptions, material unpriced or contingent costs, weak sustainability, or a pricing structure that may create substantial future cost or operational risk.
Unacceptable	0-3	Pricing is materially incomplete, unreasonable, unsupported, unsustainable, or structured in a manner that prevents meaningful evaluation of total cost and value.

Score: _____ / 15

Comments:

Total Score

Category	Maximum	Score
Experience & Organizational Qualifications	20	
Program & SMI Service Model	20	
Staffing & Workforce Plan	20	
Quality, Safety & Clinical Coordination	15	
Implementation & Readiness	10	
Financial Proposal	15	
TOTAL	100	

Scoring Guidance

- Excellent: Reserved for a response that clearly warrants the maximum score shown for the category.
- Good: Fully meets requirements with strong evidence and only minor weaknesses or limited risk.
- Acceptable: Adequately meets requirements but contains moderate gaps, limited detail, or areas requiring clarification/oversight.
- Marginal: Partially meets requirements and presents notable weaknesses, uncertainty, or risk.
- Unacceptable: Fails to adequately demonstrate the requirement or presents significant unresolved risk.

Scoring documentation: Evaluator comments should identify the principal strengths and any material weakness, gap, concern, or risk affecting the score. A score below the maximum should include sufficient explanation to support why full points were not awarded.

Evaluator Summary

Strengths:

Concerns/Risks:

Questions for Respondent:

Overall Evaluation:

- ☐ Highly Recommended
- ☐ Recommended
- ☐ Recommended with Conditions/Clarification
- ☐ Not Recommended

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator Printed Name: _____