

# VALLEY HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION dba MAT-SU HEALTH FOUNDATION

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

### Mat-Su Health Status Report Card

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Date of Issue:                        | 7.16.10           |
| 2. Deadline to Submit Written Questions: | 7.26.10 @ 12 noon |
| 2. Deadline to Submit Proposals          | 8.09.10 @ 12 noon |
| 3. Award to Successful Firm              | 8.27.10           |

The Mat-Su Health Foundation (MSHF) is requesting proposals from qualified firms interested in helping MSHF to select a health status survey tool to benchmark health status going forward, align MSHF grants and initiatives to address high impact focus areas, and achieve the goal of helping Mat-Su to become the healthiest borough in the state of Alaska by 2017. Qualified, interested parties must submit a completed proposal, along with signed cover letter, electronically by 12:00 PM, Alaska Time, 8.09.10 to:

Mat-Su Health Foundation  
Attn: Elizabeth Ripley, Executive Director  
950 E Bogard Rd Suite 218  
Wasilla, AK 99654  
[e.ripley@msrhc.com](mailto:e.ripley@msrhc.com)

Questions concerning the RFP must be submitted electronically by 12 Noon Alaska Time, .7.26.10. Responses will be provided electronically to all potential applicants by 7.30.10.

Thank you for your interest in this RFP. We look forward to your proposal.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Mat-Su Health Foundation Board of Directors has set a lofty goal to help Mat-Su become the healthiest borough in Alaska by 2017. In order to reach this goal, MSHF needs a valid and reliable tool to benchmark health status and track health status overtime comparative to all other boroughs in AK. This tool would not only meet the needs of MSHF but also the Mat-Su Public Health Department, United Way of Mat-Su, and other entities involved in raising health status in Mat-Su. MSHF ultimately strives to raise the health status of Mat-Su Residents by partnering with Mat-Su community members, agencies, and institutions to promote and create a culture of health and by ensuring that grant and initiative dollars are applied effectively to improve health status.

MSHF worked with the University of Alaska School of Social Work and School of Public Health to tackle this project. Appendix A offers a report of their work, which includes recommendations for design and implementation, along with the methodology behind each selected indicator as a measure of population health. It also includes an analysis of some of the health status report card tools in use across the country and their strengths and limitations. The UAA version of the Mat-Su Health Status Report Card does not allow MSHF to compare the Mat-Su Borough's health status with all boroughs across the state, which is critical in order to reach the MSHF goal.

MSHF would like to identify existing indicators for population health from secondary data that breaks down to the regional and sub-regional levels. A tested tool that is in use across the country to benchmark county health status rankings would be preferable. MSHF has established criteria for the health status assessment tool and the indicators selected. These measures should be:

- A. A direct or proxy measure of an important aspect of population health
- B. Sufficiently valid and reliable
- C. Reliable for diverse populations
- D. Publicly available
- E. Derived from a reliable source
- F. Current and updated at regular intervals
- G. Understood by people who need to act
- H. Available at the borough and community level.

MSHF has examined numerous tools produced by federal and state agencies. The Community Health Status Indicators (CHSI) operated by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services offers one health status assessment for every county/borough in the U.S. The County Health Rankings commissioned by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and produced by the Population Health Institute at the University of Wisconsin hold considerable promise for this health status benchmark. However, some aspects of the County Health Rankings are problematic in that numerous indicators have very wide margin of error rates due to insufficient sampling.

## **II. SCOPE OF WORK**

MSHF would like a high level review of tested health status report cards using available data at the county level that are in use across the U.S. to assess regional health status and to rank health status of counties within a state or across the entire country. MSHF seeks a recommendation on which health status tool to use going forward to benchmark Mat-Su Borough health status alongside all the other boroughs in the state. Once the tool has been selected, MSHF would like the tool's indicators analyzed for the Mat-Su Borough and the other boroughs in the state to determine when the indicator should be excluded due to the margin of error or other limitations and what alternatives would be to either complete the data picture or what limitations would exist without the indicator data. In addition, MSHF seeks recommendations on sufficient sample sizes for the various indicators that would be preferable at the borough level and even if targeted community sampling were possible using the data sources used to create the CHSI and the County Health Rankings or other applicable health status assessment tools.

Besides this tested health status report card recommendation, MSHF seeks input for other avenues to assess health status going forward in such a way that it can be timely and responsive through its partnerships and granting. If it were possible to commission the BRFSS, YRBS or other tested tools and data sources with greater sampling on an annual basis, MSHF would consider the investment. Scope includes researching this possibility and preparing a sampling size and frequency recommendation along with an associated budget.

After eliminating indicators below the acceptable MOE threshold in the selected health assessment tool, MSHF seeks an analysis of the most current data available in the selected tool to include:

- A. Recommendations for priority areas and indicators to focus on to measurably raise health status in Mat-Su (with the most significant return on investment)
- B. A logic model and defined outcomes for addressing needs and issues
- C. Strategies to impact priority areas and indicators
- D. Recommendations for evidenced-based programs and interventions per each strategy
- E. Summary of gaps in information regarding Mat-Su health status

## **III. DELIVERABLES**

The contractor will be required to provide a clearly written and attractively packaged report detailing the following:

- A. Overview of health status assessment tools using existing data
- B. Recommendation for specific health status report tool using available data to benchmark Mat-Su health status going forward
- C. Assessment of the statistical and methodological strengths and weaknesses of the selected tool and how the weaknesses should be addressed
- D. Sample size recommendations per indicator; methodology and budget to achieve sampling
- E. Analysis of Mat-Su Borough's health status determined by the selected tool, including items A through E above
- F. Formal presentation of analysis and recommendations to MSHF Grant Committee or Board of Directors.

## **IV. BUDGET**

A budget of \$15,000 has been established for this project.

## **V. WORK SCHEDULE**

The contract term and work schedule set out herein represent MSHF's best estimate of the schedule that will be followed. If a component of this schedule, such as the opening date, is delayed, the rest of the schedule will likely be shifted by the same number of days. The approximate contract schedule is as follows:

- A. Issue RFP: 7.16.10
- B. Due date of proposals: 8.09.10, 12 Noon
- C. Contract awarded by MSHF: 8.27.10
- D. First contractor work period: 8.30.10 to 9.30.10
- E. Contractor must submit first progress report and invoice by 10.15.10.
- F. Final contractor work period: 10.01.10 to 10.25.10
- G. Contractor must submit final report by 11.01.10

## **VI. PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT**

Overly lengthy and costly proposals are discouraged; however, for MSHF to evaluate proposals completely and fairly, offerors must follow the format set out in this RFP and provide all information requested.

### Introduction

Proposals must include the complete name and address of offeror's firm and the name, mailing address, and telephone number of the point person regarding the proposal. Proposals must confirm that the offeror will comply with all provisions in this RFP. Proposals must be signed by a company officer empowered to bind the company. An offeror's failure to include these items in the proposals may cause the proposal to be determined non-responsive and the proposal may be rejected.

### Understanding of the Project

Offerors must provide a comprehensive narrative statement that illustrates their understanding of the requirements of the project and the project schedule.

### Methodology Used for the Project

Offeror must provide a comprehensive narrative statement defining the methodology it intends to employ and how the methodology will serve to accomplish the work and meet the project schedule.

### Experience and Qualifications

Offeror must provide the following:

- A. A narrative description of the organization and of the project team if applicable
- B. A personnel roster that identifies each person who will actually work on the contract, along with the following information about each person listed:
  - C. title
  - D. resume
  - E. itemized estimate of hours and cost for each individual named above.
- F. Reference names and phone numbers for similar projects the offeror's firm has completed.

### Subcontractors

Subcontractors may be used to perform work under this contract. If an offeror intends to use subcontractors, the offeror must identify in the proposal the names of the subcontractors and the portions

of the work the subcontractors will perform. If a proposal with subcontractors is selected, the offeror must provide the following information concerning each prospective subcontractor:

- A. Complete name of the subcontractor
- B. Complete address of the subcontractor
- C. Type of work the subcontractor will be performing
- D. Percentage of work the subcontractor will be providing
- E. Evidence that the subcontractor holds a valid Alaska business license; and
- F. A written statement, signed by each proposed subcontractor that clearly verifies that the subcontractor is committed to render the services required by the contract.

An offeror's failure to provide this information within the time set may cause MSHF to consider the proposal non-responsive and reject it. The substitution of one subcontractor for another may be made only at the discretion and prior written approval of MSHF.

### Cost Proposal

Cost proposals must include an itemized list of all direct and indirect costs associated with the performance of the contract, including, but not limited to total number of hours at various hourly rates; direct expenses and supplies.

## **VII. Evaluation Criteria**

This evaluation will not be based on discrimination due to the race, religion, color, national origin, gender, age, marital status, pregnancy, parenthood, disability, or political affiliation of the offeror. The following weighted criteria will be used to assess the proposal:

- A. Experience and Professional Qualifications – 60%
  1. Expertise in quantitative and qualitative measurement specific to public health science
  2. Experience in research design and implementation to affect public health outcomes
  3. Demonstrated credibility across state of Alaska public and private sectors in public health science, evaluation and program planning

Qualifying experience and professional qualifications may be demonstrated by submission of a resume' or Curriculum Vita for professional staff accompanied by a comprehensive list of similar or relevant projects completed by your organization.

- B. Methodology Used for the Project – 30%

Proposals will be evaluated on whether the methodology:

  1. Depicts a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP
  2. Matches and contributes to achieving the objectives set out in the RFP
  3. Interfaces with the time schedule in the RFP

- C. Communications – 10%

Representative copies of reports, communications and other documents may be provided to demonstrate the following qualifications:

  1. Proficiency in timely, comprehensive oral and written communications
  2. Familiarity with format for progress reports and documents

## **VIII. Additional Instructions**

### Location of Work

The work is to be performed, completed and managed at the contractor's site. MSHF will not provide work space for the contractor. The contractor must provide its own work space. The contractor should include in its price proposal: transportation and per diem costs sufficient to pay for one person to make necessary trips to interface with MSHF executive staff and to make one presentation to the MSHF Grant Committee or Board of Directors.

### Required Review

Offerors should carefully review this solicitation for defects and questionable or objectionable matter. Comments concerning defects and objectionable material must be made in writing and received by the designated contact at MSHF at least ten days before the proposal opening. This will allow issuance of any necessary amendments. Protests based on any omission or error, or on the content of the solicitation, will be disallowed if these faults have not been brought to the attention of the designated contact at MSHF, in writing, at least ten days before the time set for opening.

### Questions Received Prior to Opening of Proposals

All questions must be in writing and directed and addressed to the designated contact at MSHF. The interested party must confirm telephone conversations in writing.

### Right of Rejection

Offerors must comply with all of the terms of the RFP, and all applicable local, state, and federal laws, codes, and regulations. MSHF may reject any proposal that does not comply with all of the material and substantial terms, conditions, and performance requirements of the RFP.

Offerors may not qualify the proposal nor restrict the rights of MSHF. If an offeror does, MSHF may find the proposal to be a non-responsive counter-offer and reject the proposal. Minor informalities that do not affect responsiveness and/or change the meaning/scope of the RFP may be waived by MSHF. MSHF reserves the right to refrain from making an award if it determines that to be in its best interest.

### MSHF Not Responsible for Preparation Costs

MSHF will not pay any cost associated with preparation, submittal or presentation of any proposal.

### Disclosure of Proposal Contents

All proposals and other material submitted become the property of MSHF and may be returned only at MSHF's option. All proposal information will be held in confidence during the evaluation process and prior to the time a Notice of Intent to Award is issued. Trade secrets and other proprietary data contained in proposals may be held confidential if the offeror requests, in writing and that MSHF agrees, in writing, to do so. Material considered confidential by the offeror must be clearly identified, and the offeror must include a brief statement that sets out the reasons for confidentiality.

### Offeror's Certification

By signature on the proposal, offerors certify that they comply with:

- A. the laws of the State of Alaska:
- B. the applicable portion of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964:
- C. the Equal Opportunity Act and the regulations issued thereunder by the federal government:

- D. the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the regulations issued thereunder by the federal government:
- E. all terms and conditions set out in this RFP and:
- F. a condition that the proposal submitted was independently arrived at, without collusion, under penalty of perjury: and
- G. that the offers will remain open and valid for at least 90 days.

By signature on the proposal, offerors also certify that programs, services, and activities provided to the general public under the resulting contract conform with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the regulations issued thereunder by the federal government.

If any offeror fails to comply with (a) through (g) of this paragraph, MSHF reserves the right to disregard the proposal, terminate the contract, or consider the contractor in default.

#### Conflict of Interest

Each proposal shall include a statement indicating whether or not the firm or any individuals working on the contract has a possible conflict of interest and, if so, the nature of that conflict. MSHF reserves the right to cancel the award if any interest disclosed from any source could either give the appearance of a conflict or cause speculation as to the objectivity of the program to be developed by the offeror. MSHF's determination regarding any questions of conflict of interest shall be final.

#### Discussions with Offerors

MSHF may conduct discussions with offerors in order to determine if a proposal is reasonably susceptible for award. Such discussions between the offeror and MSHF staff are permitted to clarify uncertainties or eliminate confusion concerning the contents of a proposal and which do not result in a material or substantive change to the proposal.

MSHF may also conduct discussions with offerors for the purpose of ensuring full understanding of the requirements of the RFP and proposal. Discussions will be limited to specific sections of the RFP or proposal identified by MSHF. Discussions will only be held with offerors who have submitted a proposal deemed reasonably susceptible for award by MSHF. If modifications are made as a result of these discussions, they will be put in writing. Following discussions, MSHF may set a time for best and final proposal submissions from those offerors with whom discussions were held. Proposals may be reevaluated after receipt of best and final proposal submissions.

If an offeror does not submit a best and final proposal or a notice of withdrawal, the offeror's immediate previous proposal is considered the offeror's best and final proposal.

Offerors with a disability needing accommodation should contact MSHF prior to the date set for discussions so that reasonable accommodation can be made. Any oral modification of a proposal should be reduced to writing by the offeror.

#### Alaska Business License and Other Required Licenses

At the time the proposals are opened, all offerors must hold a valid Alaska business license and any necessary applicable professional licenses required by Alaska Statute. Offerors must submit evidence of a valid Alaska business license with the proposal. An offeror's failure to submit this evidence with the proposal will cause their proposal to be determined non-responsive.

## **IX. Standard Contract Information**

### Contract Negotiations

After final evaluation, MSHF may negotiate with the offeror of the highest-ranked proposal. Negotiations, if held, shall be within the scope of the request for proposals and limited to those items that would not have an effect on the ranking of proposals. If the highest-ranked offeror fails to provide necessary information for negotiations in a timely manner, or fails to negotiate in good faith, MSHF may terminate negotiations and negotiate with the offeror of the next highest-ranked proposal. If contract negotiations are commenced, they may be held in the MSHF office, Ste. 218, 950 E. Bogard Road in Wasilla, Alaska. If the contract negotiations take place in Wasilla, Alaska, the offeror will be responsible for their travel and per diem expenses.

### Notice of Intent to Award (NIA) – Offeror Notification of Selection

After the completion of contract negotiations, MSHF will issue a written Notice of Intent to Award (NIA) and send copies to all offerors.

### Proposed Payment Procedures

MSHF will make payments based on a negotiated payment schedule. Each billing may not exceed 40% of the contract amount and must consist of an invoice and progress report. No payment will be made until the progress report and invoice have been approved by the Executive Director. MSHF will retain 20% of the contract amount until the contract is successfully completed.

### Contract Personnel

Any change of the project team members named in the proposal must be approved, in advance and in writing, by the Executive Director. Personnel changes that are not approved by MSHF may be grounds for MSHF to terminate the contract.

### Inspection and Modification – Reimbursement for Unacceptable Deliverables

The contractor is responsible for the completion of all work set out in the contract. All work is subject to inspection, evaluation, and approval by the MSHF Executive Director. MSHF may employ all reasonable means to ensure that the work is progressing and being performed in compliance with the contract. Should the MSHF determine that corrections or modifications are necessary in order to accomplish its intent, MSHF may direct the contractor to make such changes. The contractor will not unreasonably withhold such changes.

Substantial failure of the contractor to perform the contract may cause MSHF to terminate the contract. In this event, MSHF may require the contractor to reimburse monies paid (based on the identified portion of unacceptable work received) and may seek associated damages.

### Termination for Default

If MSHF determines that the contractor has refused to perform the work or has failed to perform the work with such diligence as to ensure its timely and accurate completion, MSHF may, by providing written notice to the contractor, terminate the contractor's right to proceed with part or all of the remaining work.