

Justification Statement
Higher Education Strategic Planning Commission
and its Evaluation Committee
RFP # HESP 2018-01
August 6, 2018

As required by Utah Code Section 63G-6a-708, the Higher Education Strategic Planning Commission and its evaluation committee provide this justification statement relating to the evaluation of proposals submitted in response to the RFP issued by the Higher Education Strategic Planning Commission, RFP # HESP 2018-01.

**I. Explanation of Score Assigned to Each Evaluation Category for the Highest Scoring Proposal
(The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems)**

Evaluation Criteria (Stage 3)	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Explanation of Scores
<p>The qualifications of the responder to provide consulting services; the demonstrated experience and expertise of the responder in providing services similar to the consulting services sought through this RFP, including the quality and history of any similar or equivalent services provided by the responder, the extent to which the responder’s work was actually embraced and successfully implemented, and the experience with and results from a project of a similar nature that the responder has been involved in; and the qualifications, experience, and expertise of all individuals and firms who will work with or for the responder in providing consulting services.</p>	40	40	<p>The proposal describes a highly qualified team of experts with an impressive history of substantial experience in similar projects, particularly projects involving analysis of higher education systems, in addition to institutions. The proposal also reflects experience with technical colleges, an important characteristic given the nature of Utah’s higher education system. The depth and breadth of experience in projects similar to this project are impressive. The responder has experience in not only analyzing systems but also helping to implement recommendations.</p>

Evaluation Criteria (Stage 3)	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Explanation of Scores
<p>The quality of the proposal submitted by the responder and the degree to which it is likely to be effective in helping the Commission fulfill its duties and meet its goals -- in particular, the degree to which the proposal provides the best value to the Commission and the State. Included in this criterion is the quality of the responder's narrative of the assessment of the work to be performed, the responder's ability and approach, and the degree to which the responder demonstrates an understanding of the scope of the challenge and opportunity this project presents and demonstrates an understanding of the overall performance expectations, as well as how well the responder will complete the scope of work of the consulting services within the amount identified in Section IV of the RFP and the value provided for the amount identified.</p>	35	35	<p>The proposal reflects the responder's comprehensive understanding of the challenges involved in this project and describes a superior approach and methodology for pursuing the development of a strategic plan for higher education. The proposal reflects the responder's thorough understanding of the scope of the challenges and opportunities of this project and reflects a wealth of experience in working on similar projects around the country.</p>
<p>The quality of the responder's interview presentation, including, if applicable, responses to questions from the evaluation committee, with a focus on how the responder's proposal will provide the most effective service and the best value to the Commission and the State for the amount identified in Section IV of the RFP.</p>	25	20	<p>The responder thoroughly and effectively answered all questions the evaluation committee submitted. The presenters were obviously very knowledgeable and experienced in projects of a similar nature involving higher education systems. The presenters demonstrated multiple tools and modeling approaches the responder has developed, displayed a thorough grasp of the complexities of the project, and described an approach most likely suited to achieve the best outcome of the project to develop a strategic plan for higher education in the state.</p>
<p>[Cost was not a factor and was not scored. The RFP established a maximum fee for the consulting services to be provided.]</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL SCORE	100	95	Highest score of all proposals

II. Explanation of How the Proposal Provides the Best Value

While all the proposals were of high quality, the proposal submitted by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems ("NCHEMS") provides the best value to the Commission and the state. The experience level of NCHEMS, particularly in dealing with systems of higher education, stood out as providing the best chance of success in helping the

Commission in its effort to develop a strategic plan for the system of higher education in the state. The proposal and presentation provided by NCHEMS made it clear that the approach NCHEMS will take to this project is not a cookie cutter approach but will be tailored to the unique characteristics of the state and the system of higher education in the state. The NCHEMS approach of beginning with baseline data and working from there to assess how to get to where the state needs to go is very favorable. NCHEMS also demonstrated a prior history of helping to facilitate the implementation of plans it had worked to formulate and a willingness to do the same with the strategic plan it helps the Commission to develop. The evaluation committee and the Higher Education Strategic Planning Commission are convinced that the proposal submitted by NCHEMS will result in the best approach and effort to help the Commission fulfill its duties and responsibilities and accomplish what it is working to accomplish in developing a strategic plan for the system of higher education in Utah and will provide the best value to the Commission and the state.