

# Interview Score Sheets

# Team Interviews Rating Sheet

The Interview component considers the team's qualifications and experience. The Interviews should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the interviews the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Offerors the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Team Interview should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the Interview was better than the average interview (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the Interview was about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision).
- C. A "1" represents that the Interview was significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work).

Offeror	Rating and Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "1" or "10" rating for debriefing purposes. The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>				
	Training Lead	Business Process Reengineering Lead	Technical Lead	Finance & Procurement Lead	Project Manager
CIBER	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10   5 (1) Pm did not seem to know project budget proposal and side stepped most questions, very uncomfortable
CGI	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10   5   1 Pm knew project and needs very well / been involved from start / hand selected team / could answer all questions w/ no hesitation
CedarCrestone	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10   5 (1) mainly talked about training / only with company 10 months Did not link BPR	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Team Interview You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Brook Larson  
Printed Name

Brook Larson  
Signature

12/3/10  
Date

*GA ✓*

## Team Interviews Rating Sheet

The Interview component considers the team's qualifications and experience. The Interviews should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the interviews the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Offerors the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Team Interview should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the Interview was better than the average interview (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).  
 B. A "5" represents that the Interview was about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision).  
 C. A "1" represents that the Interview was significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work).

Offeror	Rating and Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "1" or "10" rating for debriefing purposes. The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>				
	Training Lead	Business Process Reengineering Lead	Technical Lead	Finance & Procurement Lead	Project Manager
CIBER	✓ 10   (5)   1	✓ 10   5   (1) This person will not be on the team that implements the ERP for the State.	✓ 10   (5)   1	✓ 10   (5)   1	10   (5)   (1) CAS Did not know budget total or details
CGI	✓ 10   (5)   1	✓ 10   (5)   1	✓ 10   (5)   1	✓ 10   (5)   1	(10) 5   1 Sure of herself - never hesitated in her responses. Realistic timeline of 40 months. Involved since the RFI. Picked her team.
CedarCrestone	✓ 10   (5)   1	✓ 10   5   (1) Presented same info as training lead. Responses not in depth. Didn't utilize time.	✓ 10   5   (1) Was weak in responses. <del>Accepted the organization as a limitation.</del> This will be first job at CedarCrestone.	✓ 10   (5)   1	10   (5)   (1) CAS <del>Was weak in confidence and responses. Did not look at entire team. Unrealistic timeline of 40 months.</del>

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Team Interview You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Cheryl Shakespeare

Printed Name

*Cheryl Shakespeare*  
Signature

12/03/10

Date

*SA ✓*

## Team Interviews Rating Sheet

The Interview component considers the team's qualifications and experience. The Interviews should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the interviews the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Offerors the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Team Interview should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the Interview was better than the average interview (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the Interview was about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision).
- C. A "1" represents that the Interview was significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work).

Rating and Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "1" or "10" rating for debriefing purposes. The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>					
Offeror	Training Lead	Business Process Reengineering Lead	Technical Lead	Finance & Procurement Lead	Project Manager
CIBER	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 <i>change - reminded that this person indicated would not likely be actually be part of team</i>	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 <i>Very argumentative, not accurate on cost response (at \$ by many millions)</i>
CGI	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 <i>Good explanation of lessons learned, "Have to <del>get</del> train to new jobs" good</i>	✓ 10   5   1 <i>Could follow well at ease, understood issues</i>	✓ 10   5   1 <i>Good coverage have to get to today good lessons learned, good understanding of time</i>	✓ 10   5   1 <i>Outstanding knowledge of RFP, our issues, risks, by far best versed in all aspects</i>
CedarCrestone	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 <i>Spent much time on training, not on BPR</i>	✓ 10   5   1 <i>good group of timeline</i>	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Team Interview You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Daniel R. Spence      [Signature]      12-3-10  
 Printed Name                      Signature                      Date

[Signature]

## Team Interviews Rating Sheet

The Interview component considers the team's qualifications and experience. The Interviews should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the interviews the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Offerors the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Team Interview should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the Interview was better than the average interview (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).  
 B. A "5" represents that the Interview was about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision).  
 C. A "1" represents that the Interview was significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work).

Offeror	Rating and Comments/Concerns (The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "1" or "10" rating for debriefing purposes. The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)				
	Training Lead	Business Process Reengineering Lead	Technical Lead	Finance & Procurement Lead	Project Manager
CIBER	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10   (5)   1 BPR lead won't be available for our project	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10   5   (1) PM did not know proj budget
CGI	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ (10)   5   1 PM knew project inside & out, identified some missing items
CedarCrestone	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10   5   (1) Addressed training not BPR	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10 (5) 1	✓ 10   (5)   1

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Team Interview. You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Marlys Hagen  
Printed Name

Marlys Hagen  
Signature

12/3/10  
Date

SJA ✓

# Team Interviews Rating Sheet

The Interview component considers the team's qualifications and experience. The interviews should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the interviews the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Offerors the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Team Interview should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the Interview was better than the average interview (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the Interview was about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision).
- C. A "1" represents that the Interview was significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work).

Rating and Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "1" or "10" rating for debriefing purposes. The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>					
Offeror	Training Lead	Business Process Reengineering Lead	Technical Lead	Finance & Procurement Lead	Project Manager
CIBER	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 -unrealistic timeline; didn't have financial proposals info; unprepared
CGI	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 Been w/ CGI (28 yrs) many yrs & knows how to get the answers & people to call * All Gov't Accounting	✓ 10   5   1 * well thought out plan; been involved w/ RFP since the start; clearly understood State's needs & identified relevant info the state might not have included - (unions etc)
CedarCrestone	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 didn't address BPR & chg Man - only talked about training issues.	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Team Interview You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Stacie Bentley

Printed Name

Stacie Bentley

Signature

12/3/10

Date

GA ✓

## Team Interviews Rating Sheet

The Interview component considers the team's qualifications and experience. The Interviews should be rated comparatively to one another. It is important for the evaluator to understand that it is the offeror's responsibility to clearly differentiate themselves from one another. If the offerors do not clearly differentiate themselves from one another, the evaluator should give all of the interviews the same score. The evaluator's role is not to rank each plan, but to identify if any plan(s) clearly stand out from one another. The evaluator may give the Offerors the same score if there is no dominant differential. Each Team Interview should be rated on a scale of 1-5-10.

- A. A "10" represents that the Interview was better than the average interview (clearly shows differential, clearly shows that the offeror has expertise doing this type of work).
- B. A "5" represents that the Interview was about average (or there is insufficient information to make a clear decision).
- C. A "1" represents that the Interview was significantly below the average (shows deficiency, provides no value to prove expertise doing this type of work).

Offeror	Rating and Comments/Concerns <i>(The evaluator must describe/explain reasons for any "1" or "10" rating for debriefing purposes. The evaluator may attach additional pages if necessary)</i>				
	Training Lead	Business Process Reengineering Lead	Technical Lead	Finance & Procurement Lead	Project Manager
CIBER	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 <i>TM 12/3/10</i> DID NOT IDENTIFY ANY ASSUMPTIONS/RISKS OR STATE DECISION POINTS FOR Q2 -	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 WAS NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR W/ PROPOSAL COSTS AND DID NOT APPEAR TO HAVE GRASP OF PROJECT
CGI	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 FORWARD PLANNING TOWARDS HONEST INTER-ACTION DURING PRE-AWARD FIT GAP PLAN TO REDUCE THE DIFFERENCES AND # OF RQTS MET	✓ 10   5   1 VERY FAMILIAR W/COST BUILT OWN TEAM INVOLVED SINCE RFI TEAM ATTENDED ALL FUNCTION AND WERE WELL ORGANIZED + READY
CedarCrestone	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1 DID NOT ADDRESS BPR JUST KEPT REFERRING TO TRAINING PROCESS	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1	✓ 10   5   1

By signing your name below, you confirm that you have based your scores on the contents of each Team Interview. You further agree that there is no collusion or conflict of interest between yourself and any other party involved.

Tom Mayer  
Printed Name

*Tom Mayer*  
Signature

12/3/10  
Date

*SAV*