SECTION I. PROJECT BACKGROUND, OVERVIEW, AND GOALS

A. BACKGROUND:

The University of Colorado (hereafter referred to as the University) is issuing this request for proposal (RFP) seeking competitive, responsive applications from qualified practice transformation organizations (PTOs) to provide practice facilitation and/or clinical health information technology advisor (CHITA) services for large scale practice transformation programs. Statewide practice transformation efforts include but are not limited to the State Innovation Model (SIM) program and the Transforming Clinical Practice Initiative (TCPI). The University will select PTOs who will work together to provide practice transformation support to primary care and potentially to specialty practices to improve health and healthcare in Colorado.

Detailed solicitation information, timelines and response submission requirements are available in Attachment A.

B. OVERVIEW:

Practice transformation is a process that results in observable and measurable changes to practice behavior (www.cms.gov). Practice transformation focuses on core competencies that include: engaged leadership and quality improvement; empanelment and improved patient health outcomes; business and financial expertise; continuous and team-based healing relationships that incorporate culture, values, and beliefs; organized evidence-based care; patience-centered interactions; enhanced access; progression toward population-based care management; state-of-the-art, results-linked care; intentional approach of practices to maximize the systematic engagement of patients and families; and systematic efforts to reduce unnecessary diagnostic testing and procedures.

C. GOALS FOR THIS PROJECT:

This RFP is seeking to establish a pool of approved vendors to serve as Practice Transformation Organizations (PTOs) to provide either, or both, of the following supportive functions to assist in practice redesign:

1. Providing practice facilitation to primary care practices to accomplish the goals and milestones set out for the identified program, which could include SIM, TCPI, and/or other programs that are pending review but will require comparable competencies.

2. Providing clinical health information technology advisor (CHITA) support for practices to enhance large scale transformation initiatives.

For additional detail around the goals and purpose of this RFP see Attachment A.

SECTION II. STATEMENT OF WORK

Please see Attachment A to this RFP for information on the Statement of Work.

SECTION III. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION
All specific response items represent the minimum information to be submitted. Deletions or incomplete responses in terms of content or aberrations in form may, at the University’s discretion, render the response non-responsive. Offerors shall electronically submit Attachment B. Request for Proposal Response Form in response to this RFP to Natalie Buys: natalie.buys@ucdenver.edu.

Late proposals will not be accepted. It is the responsibility of the offeror to ensure that the proposal is submitted on or before the proposal opening date and time. Please do not wait until the last minute to submit your response. It is recommended offerors begin the submission at least a minimum of four hours before the submission deadline.

Proposals must be submitted electronically as specified above.

SECTION IV. EVALUATION AND AWARD

1. EVALUATION PROCESS

The University will conduct a comprehensive, thorough, complete and impartial evaluation of each Proposal received. Failure of an offeror to provide any required information and/or failure to follow the response format set forth in the RFP Administrative Information, and Attachment B may result in the disqualification of the Proposal. It is the offeror’s responsibility to assure that offeror’s Proposal is complete in accordance with the direction provided within all solicitation documents.

All proposals submitted in response to this RFP will be reviewed for responsiveness by the Purchasing Agent prior to referral to the evaluation committee. A committee will then evaluate all responsive proposals in accordance with the criteria described below. Total scores will be tabulated, and the qualified offerors will be put on the list of Authorized PTOs.

The contract will be awarded to offerors deemed qualified by the evaluation committee. The PSC purchasing office, after review and approval of the evaluation committee’s written recommendation, will notify all offerors via a posting on an electronic solicitation notification system of the results of the RFP evaluation. The posting will be an announcement of “Notice of Intent to Make an Award” which will name the apparent winning offerors. The Authorized List will consist of offerors deemed qualified by the Evaluation Committee and be valid until, at minimum, January 2019 or until funding for these activities has reached the contracted end dates. At any time the University, at its sole discretion, may provide an opportunity for additional vendors to be added to the List. If the University chooses to do that, interested organizations will submit the same information as asked for in this RFP and that information will be evaluated by an authorized evaluation committee and qualified PTO’s may be added to the list.

2. EVALUATION COMMITTEE

An Evaluation Committee will be compiled based on subject matter expertise while utilizing measures to ensure the integrity of the evaluation process. These measures include the following: selecting an evaluator who does not have a conflict of interest regarding this solicitation; facilitating the independent review of Proposals; requiring the evaluation of Proposals to be based strictly on the content of the Proposal; and ensuring the fair and impartial treatment of all offerors. The Evaluation Committee will be composed of no more than twelve individuals and no less than three.
3. COMPLIANCE

Failure of an offeror to comply with the requirements of this RFP solicitation may result in the applicant being disqualified as non-responsive. Such disqualification may occur at any point following the opening of the RFP.

4. EVALUATION AND PTO SELECTION CRITERIA

In preparing responses, offerors should describe in detail how they propose to meet the specifications as outlined in the following sections. Specific factors will be applied to proposal information to assist the University in selecting the most qualified organizations.

PTOs will be selected as approved vendors to provide practice transformation services on the basis of their working relationships with Colorado health care practices and experience or expertise in content areas required for practice transformation, including practice facilitation and/or clinical health information technology advisor (CHITA) services.

Applicants will be evaluated on the following criteria:

EVALUATION CRITERIA

ORGANIZATION DESCRIPTION AND PRACTICE TRANSFORMATION EXPERIENCE
- Organizational experience working with Colorado health care practices
- Success in supporting practice transformation in primary and/or specialty practices

PERSONNEL EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE
- Experience of proposed personnel providing practice transformation support to practices
- Expertise and training of personnel in areas needed for practice transformation

METHODOLOGY AND PRACTICE TRANSFORMATION APPROACH
- Approach used for delivering practice transformation support

Applicants will demonstrate their ability to meet the criteria by completing Attachment B, RFP Response Form.

The University of Colorado Procurement Rules state a Purchasing Agent shall make purchases from, and award Contracts to, Responsible vendors only. The University reserves the right to make its offeror responsibility determination at any time in this RFP process and may not make a responsibility determination for every offeror.

Factors to be considered in determining whether the standard of responsibility has been met include whether an offeror has:
1. availability of the appropriate financial, material, equipment, facility, and personnel resources and expertise, or the ability to obtain the resources necessary to indicate the capability to meet all contractual requirements;
2. a satisfactory record of performance;
3. a satisfactory record of integrity;

4. the legal authority to contract with the University; and

5. supplied all necessary information in connection with the inquiry concerning responsibility.

The offeror shall supply information requested by the University in Attachment B concerning the offeror's responsibility. The University reserves the right to request further information as it deems necessary to determine the offeror's responsibility. If the offeror fails to supply the requested information, the University shall base the determination of responsibility upon any available information or may find the offeror non-responsible if such failure is unreasonable.