

**JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN**  
**Section of Minutes from the Transformation Design Committee's June 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
**Relating to "Qualifications of People Scoring RFP"**

***Review Breakout Group Assignments***

Performance Based Contracting experts Charlotte McCullough and Mary Armstrong explained the afternoon assignments and gave directions for reporting back to the committee. Charlotte McCullough said that the purpose of the breakout groups was to get committee members input on a number of key issues regarding the RFP and scoring issues.

The committee members were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. Who should score the RFPs?
2. Who should be the key qualifications for a MC?
3. What is the best transition plan for moving from current contracts to MCs?
4. What should be included in the on-site readiness review?

***Breakout Group Reports***

Co-chair Judge Leonard Costello welcomed the committee members back from the breakout groups and gave directions for how reports would proceed. The breakout groups elected representatives, Maureen McGrath and Liz Mueller, who then presented summaries of the group discussions.

*1. Who should score the RFP?*

Group 1 suggested:

- The evaluators should be objective and not have a conflict of interest.
- The review team should have a mix of both academic and child welfare backgrounds.
- Reviewers should have background knowledge of:
  - Finance
  - Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA)
  - Braam requirements
  - Racial disproportionality
- Reviewers should have experience delivering social work services.
- How many evaluators? "Enough, but not too many."
- Reviewers should be able to represent consumers and understand consumer needs.
- Reviewers should have an understanding of regional needs.
- Reviewers should be given clear instructions on purpose of evaluation and should be provided clear information regarding the regional needs.
- Reviewers should be uninterested in which bidders are chosen.
- Serving on the CWTDC shouldn't preclude individuals from scoring bids.

Group 2 suggested:

- Subcontractors should be articulated and removed from scoring process.
- Reviewers should have background with infrastructure and capacity understanding (i.e. IT and HR)
- Review teams could be diversified by recruiting individuals from mental health, law enforcement, non-profit foundations, etc.
- Review teams might want to include peer-reviewers from other states.
- Regional Administrators from CA.

- Foster youth and alums.
- Review teams could be composed of large number of individuals so that individual biases are diminished as they are averaged out.
- Review team should have regional knowledge.
- Reviewers should operate from a youth-engagement and family engagement perspective.
- Review team should have experience with working with the state and with licensing.