

**CONSENT CALENDAR - AGENDA ITEM NO. 4**  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**November 20, 2014**

TO: Executive Committee, Orange County Fire Authority

FROM: Jeremy Hammond, Human Resources Director

SUBJECT: **Award of Contract for Request for Proposal No. DC1920 – Online Performance Evaluation Software**

Summary:

This agenda item is submitted to present the recommendation of contract award for online performance evaluation software to GovernmentJobs.Com, doing business as NEOGOV, the number one ranked firm in the RFP process.

Committee Action:

Since the November 4, 2014, meeting of the Human Resources Committee was cancelled, no prior committee action was taken on this item; however, this staff report was forwarded to members of the Human Resources Committee for review.

Recommended Actions:

1. Approve and authorize the Fire Chief to sign the Professional Services Agreement to establish a blanket order contract with NEOGOV for a three year period for a not to exceed amount of \$170,000.
2. Approve and authorize up to a 10% contingency (\$6,350) for additional services or training that may be required during implementation. This amount is based on the first year contract amount of \$63,497.

Background:

In a continued effort to improve the completion rate and quality of performance evaluations while easing the administrative burden on the Human Resources Department (HR), HR has embarked on a journey to automate the performance evaluation process. Full automation of the currently paper process will allow completion of the performance evaluation form online, on any computer and will also provide electronic workflow that will route the completed draft evaluation to a supervisor or manager for review and approval prior to delivery to the subject employee. Performance evaluation automation also allows for improved tracking of past due evaluations and will allow HR to proactively notify supervisors and managers when evaluations are due and past due to increase compliance rates. Finally, the fully automated performance evaluation process allows better reporting capabilities, including tracking compliance by supervisor, manager, battalion and division.

***RFP Preparation***

On March 21, 2014, an RFP was issued to solicit proposals from firms to design, implement, and maintain an online employee performance evaluation system and 163 firms were notified. On April 7, 2014, eight (8) firms attended the pre-proposal meeting. Nine (9) proposals were received on the April 15, 2014 due date.

An evaluation committee consisting of a cross section of labor representatives and the Human Resources department reviewed the proposals submitted. Based on the evaluation of the proposals submitted, three (3) short-listed firms; NEOGOV, Promantak, and CRG were invited to demonstrate their software solutions to the evaluation committee. After the completion of the final scoring, NEOGOV was the highest ranked firm.

***Negotiations & Results***

The evaluation committee recommended entering into negotiations with NEOGOV. The NEOGOV Insight Enterprise software has been utilized by OCFA recruiting services since 2006. As part of the negotiations, OCFA requested a three-year discounted price, bundling the current Insight software with the online performance and onboarding software licenses and co-terming the licenses.

A Best and Final Offer (BAFO) was received from NEOGOV on October 23, 2014, that included a discounted bundled pricing for a three year contract. The Insight Enterprise software will be co-termed with the new software modules and the new cost reflects a 7% discount from the original offer and the previous Insight Enterprise software license. OCFA will save \$12,500 during the three-year contract period as a result of the contract negotiations.

The Purchasing and Materials Manager confirms that the proposal and evaluation process was conducted in accordance with the OCFA's Purchasing Ordinance and all applicable rules and regulations. Based upon the evaluation committee's recommendation, it is recommended that the contract for the bundled Human Resources Software Solution is awarded to NEOGOV.

Impact to Cities/County:

Not Applicable.

Fiscal Impact:

Included in the 2014/15 budget.

Staff Contacts for Further Information:

Jeremy Hammond, HR Director  
[jeremyhammond@ocfa.org](mailto:jeremyhammond@ocfa.org)  
(714) 573-6018

Debbie Casper, Purchasing Manager  
[debbiecasper@ocfa.org](mailto:debbiecasper@ocfa.org)  
(714) 573-6641

Attachments:

1. Online Performance Evaluation Scores & Rankings
2. Best and Final Offer
3. Professional Services Agreement (on file with the Clerk of the Authority and available upon request)

**ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY  
DC1920 – Online Performance Evaluation**

**Proposals Received**

| <b>Firm</b>                    | <b>First Year Cost Proposal</b> | <b>Firm</b>                           | <b>First Year Cost Proposal</b> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Promantak Inc./Trakstar</i> | \$ 32,213                       | <i>Governmentjobs.com Inc./NEOGOV</i> | \$ 37,477                       |
| <i>Bullseye Engagement LLC</i> | \$ 84,977                       | <i>Silkroad Technology &amp; HRMS</i> | \$ 87,334                       |
| <i>Cornerstone On Demand</i>   | \$ 86,050                       | <i>HRE/Tenzinga</i>                   | \$399,184                       |
| <i>CRG/EmPerform</i>           | \$ 45,816                       | <i>Aspire HR Inc.</i>                 | \$135,776                       |
| <i>Halogen Software</i>        | \$ 64,557                       |                                       |                                 |

**Evaluation Scores**

|                                     | <b>Neogov</b>                              |           |            |            |            |            | <b>Promantak/Trakstar</b>   |           |            |            |            |            |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Cost Proposal</b>                | <b>37,477.00</b>                           |           |            |            |            |            | <b>32,213.00</b>            |           |            |            |            |            |
| Evaluators                          | 1  | 2         | 3          | 4          | 5          | 6          | 1                           | 2         | 3          | 4          | 5          | 6          |
| A. Method of Approach (30)          | 30   | 30        | 25         | 30         | 30         | 28         | 25                          | 25        | 20         | 30         | 30         | 30         |
| B. Qualifications & Experience (20) | 20   | 20        | 18         | 20         | 17         | 20         | 16                          | 10        | 15         | 20         | 20         | 20         |
| C. Technical Capabilities (25)      | 25   | 25        | 22         | 20         | 25         | 23         | 20                          | 18        | 18         | 25         | 25         | 25         |
| D. Proposed Costs (25)              | 21.5                                       | 21.5      | 21.5       | 21.5       | 21.5       | 21.5       | 25.0                        | 25.0      | 25.0       | 25.0       | 25.0       | 25.0       |
| Sum of Proposal Scores              | 96.5                                       | 96.5      | 86.5       | 91.5       | 93.5       | 92.5       | 86.0                        | 78.0      | 78.0       | 100.0      | 100.0      | 100.0      |
| Individual Ranking                  | 1  | 1         | 1          | 2          | 2          | 2          | 2                           | 3         | 2          | 1          | 1          | 1          |
| Sum of Written Ranking              | <b>9</b>                                   |           |            |            |            |            | <b>10</b>                   |           |            |            |            |            |
| Demonstrations (50)                 | 50   | 0         | 47         | 40         | 0          | 45         | 35                          | 0         | 40         | 30         | 45         | 48         |
| Sum of both written & presentation  | <b>146</b>                                 | <b>96</b> | <b>133</b> | <b>131</b> | <b>93</b>  | <b>137</b> | <b>121</b>                  | <b>78</b> | <b>118</b> | <b>130</b> | <b>145</b> | <b>148</b> |
| Individual Ranking w/demo           | <b>1</b>                                   | <b>1</b>  | <b>1</b>   | <b>1</b>   | <b>3</b>   | <b>2</b>   | <b>2</b>                    | <b>3</b>  | <b>2</b>   | <b>2</b>   | <b>1</b>   | <b>1</b>   |
| Sum of Ranking w/Interview          | <b>9</b>                                   |           |            |            |            |            | <b>11</b>                   |           |            |            |            |            |
|                                     | <b>Corporate Renaissance/CRG emPerform</b> |           |            |            |            |            | <b>Cornerstone OnDemand</b> |           |            |            |            |            |
| <b>Cost Proposal Year 1</b>         | <b>45,816.00</b>                           |           |            |            |            |            | <b>\$86,050.00</b>          |           |            |            |            |            |
| Evaluators                          | 1  | 2         | 3          | 4          | 5          | 6          | 1                           | 2         | 3          | 4          | 5          | 6          |
| A. Method of Approach (30)          | 23   | 30        | 20         | 30         | 30         | 27         | 25                          | 20        | 26         | 10         | 30         | 20         |
| B. Qualifications & Experience (20) | 14   | 20        | 10         | 15         | 15         | 20         | 18                          | 15        | 21         | 10         | 20         | 15         |
| C. Technical Capabilities (25)      | 14   | 25        | 15         | 20         | 25         | 25         | 20                          | 20        | 20         | 20         | 25         | 20         |
| D. Proposed Costs (25)              | 17.6                                       | 17.6      | 17.6       | 17.6       | 17.6       | 17.6       | 9.4                         | 9.4       | 9.4        | 9.4        | 9.4        | 9.4        |
| Sum of Proposal Scores              | 68.6                                       | 92.6      | 62.6       | 82.6       | 87.6       | 89.6       | 72.4                        | 64.4      | 76.4       | 49.4       | 84.4       | 64.4       |
| Individual Ranking                  | 4  | 2         | 4          | 3          | 3          | 3          | 3                           | 5         | 3          | 6          | 4          | 6          |
| Sum of Written Ranking              | <b>19</b>                                  |           |            |            |            |            | <b>27</b>                   |           |            |            |            |            |
| Demonstrations (50)                 | 40   | 0         | 47         | 40         | 42         | 35         | N/A                         | N/A       | N/A        | N/A        | N/A        | N/A        |
| Sum of both written & presentation  | <b>109</b>                                 | <b>93</b> | <b>110</b> | <b>123</b> | <b>130</b> | <b>125</b> | <b>72</b>                   | <b>64</b> | <b>76</b>  | <b>49</b>  | <b>84</b>  | <b>64</b>  |
| Individual Ranking w/demo           | <b>3</b>                                   | <b>2</b>  | <b>3</b>   | <b>3</b>   | <b>2</b>   | <b>3</b>   | <b>4</b>                    | <b>5</b>  | <b>4</b>   | <b>6</b>   | <b>4</b>   | <b>6</b>   |
| Sum of Ranking w/Interview          | <b>16</b>                                  |           |            |            |            |            | <b>29</b>                   |           |            |            |            |            |

|                                     | <b>Silkroad Technology &amp; HRMS<br/>(Business Partners)</b> |      |      |      |      |      | <b>Bullseye Evaluation</b> |      |      |      |      |      |
|-------------------------------------|---|------|------|------|------|------|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Cost Proposal Year 1</b>         | <b>87,334.00</b>  |      |      |      |      |      | <b>84,977.00</b>           |      |      |      |      |      |
| Evaluators                          | 1   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 1                          | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
| A. Method of Approach (30)          | 12  | 15   | 13   | 30   | 30   | 15   | 15                         | 15   | 20   | 15   | 20   | 20   |
| B. Qualifications & Experience (20) | 8   | 8    | 12   | 10   | 20   | 15   | 10                         | 5    | 10   | 10   | 18   | 10   |
| C. Technical Capabilities (25)      | 18  | 5    | 15   | 10   | 25   | 10   | 15                         | 15   | 19   | 10   | 25   | 20   |
| D. Proposed Costs (25)              | 9.2   | 9.2  | 9.2  | 9.2  | 9.2  | 9.2  | 9.5                        | 9.5  | 9.5  | 9.5  | 9.5  | 9.5  |
| Sum of Proposal Scores              | 47.2  | 37.2 | 49.2 | 59.2 | 84.2 | 49.2 | 49.5                       | 44.5 | 58.5 | 44.5 | 72.5 | 59.5 |
| Individual Ranking                  | 8   | 7    | 8    | 5    | 5    | 9    | 7                          | 6    | 5    | 7    | 8    | 7    |
| Sum of Written Ranking              | <b>42</b>   |      |      |      |      |      | <b>40</b>                  |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                     | <b>HRE/Tenzinga</b>   |      |      |      |      |      | <b>Aspire HR</b>           |      |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Cost Proposal</b>                | <b>399,184.00</b>   |      |      |      |      |      | <b>135,776.28</b>          |      |      |      |      |      |
| Evaluators                          | 1   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 1                          | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
| A. Method of Approach (30)          | 0   | 0    | 0    | 15   | 24   | 25   | 20                         | 0    | 18   | 10   | 27   | 20   |
| B. Qualifications & Experience (20) | 18  | 0    | 17   | 10   | 20   | 20   | 12                         | 0    | 14   | 10   | 20   | 20   |
| C. Technical Capabilities (25)      | 12  | 0    | 0    | 15   | 15   | 10   | 20                         | 0    | 18   | 10   | 25   | 20   |
| D. Proposed Costs (25)              | 2.0   | 2.0  | 2.0  | 2.0  | 2.0  | 2.0  | 5.9                        | 5.9  | 5.9  | 5.9  | 5.9  | 6.0  |
| Sum of Proposal Scores              | 32.0  | 2.0  | 19.0 | 42.0 | 61.0 | 57.0 | 57.9                       | 5.9  | 55.9 | 35.9 | 77.9 | 66.0 |
| Individual Ranking                  | 9   | 9    | 9    | 8    | 9    | 8    | 6                          | 8    | 6    | 9    | 7    | 5    |
| Written Sum of Ranking              | <b>52</b>   |      |      |      |      |      | <b>41</b>                  |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                     | <b>Halogen Software</b>                                       |      |      |      |      |      |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Cost Proposal</b>                | <b>64,557.60</b>  |      |      |      |      |      |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| Evaluators                          | 1   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| A. Method of Approach (30)          | 20  | 20   | 10   | 30   | 22   | 25   |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| B. Qualifications & Experience (20) | 14  | 15   | 13   | 15   | 20   | 16   |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| C. Technical Capabilities (25)      | 18  | 20   | 17   | 20   | 25   | 15   |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| D. Proposed Costs (25)              | 12.5  | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sum of Proposal Scores              | 64.5  | 67.5 | 52.5 | 77.5 | 79.5 | 68.5 |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| Individual Ranking                  | 5   | 4    | 7    | 4    | 6    | 4    |                            |      |      |      |      |      |
| Written Sum of Ranking              | <b>30</b>   |      |      |      |      |      |                            |      |      |      |      |      |



## REQUEST FOR BEST AND FINAL OFFER

### RFP DC1920 – ONLINE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

**DATE BEST AND FINAL OFFERS REQUESTED: OCTOBER 9, 2014**

**DUE DATE FOR BEST AND FINAL OFFER: OCTOBER 17, 2014 AT 3:00 P.M.  
EXTENDED TO OCTOBER 24, 2014 AT 3:00 P.M.**

Your firm, Government.Jobs.com, Inc., submitted a proposal in response to the above referenced Request for Proposal (RFP) issued by the Orange County Fire Authority.

As part of the negotiation process, the Orange County Fire Authority is exercising the right to request a Best and Final Offer from the top ranking firm for further evaluation and consideration.

The purpose of the Best and Final Offer is to allow both OCFA and your firm to make any modifications to the terms of the contract before making the final decision in the award.

OCFA would like additional consideration from Government.Jobs.com, Inc. on the following items:

- ***Extend proposal to provide time for contract award***
- ***New pricing to bundle current insight enterprise license, onboarding, and performance evaluation (co-term contracts – current Insight contract term is from 10/1-09/30)***
- ***Discounted bundled pricing for three-year contract with no pre-pay requirement***

Please complete the attached price page and provide a response to the questions.

Best and Final Offers must be received by the Orange County Fire Authority - Purchasing Section no later than the deadline specified above. Please submit your response to this request via e-mail to: [debbiecasper@ocfa.org](mailto:debbiecasper@ocfa.org).

The Best and Final Offer will further assist in making our final recommendation. Please complete the pricing page for further consideration. Contingent upon the outcome of the best and final offer, the contractual concerns need to be addressed. OCFA intends to use the standard Professional Services Agreement (PSA) provided in the RFP. No exceptions were identified in your submitted proposal. Please review the attached copy of the PSA and provide a red-line draft or suggestions for incorporating your service level agreement for consideration and legal review.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with Orange County Fire Authority.

Best Regards,

Debbie Casper, C.P.M., CPPB  
Purchasing & Materials Manager



**BEST AND FINAL PRICING PAGE**

The initial NEOGOV proposal offered design, implementation, training, and 1<sup>st</sup> year maintenance cost for the online performance evaluation system for a total cost of \$37,477.

OCFA is request a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) for the online performance evaluation system, the *addition* of onboarding functionality and the *current* insight enterprise module. Please complete the pricing schedule below and answer the additional questions.

| Development Implementation Cost  |                    |                    |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES  | Original Cost      | BAFO               |
| Design/Implementation Costs for Performance Evaluation:<br>Includes cost to meet with OCFA project team staff, develop customized forms, adapt system to OCFA needs, develop user interfaces and implement system. | \$4,000.00         | \$3,720.00         |
| <b><i>Design/Implementation Costs for Onboarding Module</i></b>  | N/A                | \$2,325.00         |
| Implementation Training Cost   |                    |                    |
| DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES  | Original Cost      | BAFO               |
| Performance Evaluation Administrator Training  | \$2,500.00         | \$2,325.00         |
| Onboarding Administrator Training  | N/A                | \$2,325.00         |
| First Year Cost  |                    |                    |
| DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES  | Original Cost      | BAFO               |
| Performance Evaluation License/Maintenance   | \$30,977.00        | \$28,808.00        |
| <b><i>Onboarding License/Maintenance</i></b>   | N/A                | \$14,880.00        |
| <b><i>Insight Enterprise License/Maintenance</i></b><br><i>Current annual cost \$9,800 (10/1 – 9/30)</i>   | N/A                | \$9,114.00         |
| <b>First Year Cost</b>   | <b>\$37,477.00</b> | <b>\$63,497.00</b> |

| Annual Cost  |                    |                     |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|
| DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES                              | Year Two           | Year Three          |
| Performance Evaluation License/Maintenance           | \$28,808.00        | \$28,808.00         |
| Onboarding License/Maintenance                       | \$14,880.00        | \$14,880.00         |
| Insight Enterprise License/Maintenance               | \$9,114.00         | \$9,114.00          |
| <b>2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Cost</b> | <b>\$58,802.00</b> | <b>\$58,802.00</b>  |
| <b>Three Year Contract Amount</b>                    |                    | <b>\$169,101.00</b> |

1. The current proposal expires 180 days from the date of submittal April 11, 2014. Can Government.Jobs.com extend Will you extend this date to allow OCFA to finalize a contract or replace this offer with the BAFO? Please provide information

**NEOGOV Response** – Yes. NEOGOV will honor all items from the original response as well as the BAFO pricing above through contract completion.

---

2. The original offer provided for a 7% discount for a three year prepayment. Would NEOGOV consider honoring the discount for a three year contract without the prepayment? If not a 7% discount, is there another offer NEOGOV is willing to offer?

**NEOGOV Response** – Yes. In lieu of a pre-payment discount, NEOGOV has applied a 7% discount off ALL items based on bundled pricing and we have extended this pricing for the 3 year period. Please note that this discount is based on OCFA's purchase of all 3 platforms.

---

3. Since OCFA is further considering the complete NEOGOV solution for online performance evaluation, onboarding and insight, we are requesting to have the licenses co-termed. Currently the insight Enterprise module is termed from October 1 through September 30<sup>th</sup>). Please indicate if you are willing to co-term the licenses and if so what the term will be.

**NEOGOV Response** – Yes. NEOGOV is happy to co-term all license items. In regards to term duration, our recommendation would be to set the new term based on estimated contract completion and then include a pro-rated amount for your existing Insight license as a separate line item. This way OCFA can continue using Insight throughout the contracting process.

---

**TO THE ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY:**

The Undersigned hereby amends the original proposal as indicated in this Best and Final Offer and shall provide Human Resources software applications in compliance with all terms, scope of work, conditions, specifications, and amendments in the Request for Proposal which is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. The representations herein are made under penalty of perjury.

GovernmentJobs.Com, Inc. (d/b/a NEOGOV)

---

Name of Company

222 N Sepulveda Blvd, Ste 2000  
Address

---

El Segundo  
City

CA  
State

90245  
Zip

---

BEST AND FINAL OFFER

RFP DC1920 – ONLINE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Person Authorized to Sign

October 22, 2014  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Scott Letoumeau  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

President  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title