



# STANDARD CONTRACT REVIEW PROTOCOL

---

The California Chapter of the American Planning Association has adopted the following Standard Contracting Protocol for the purposes of establishing, review, and as applicable, re-bidding contracts. This protocol is intended to facilitate excellent performance and ensure that contractors are providing high quality and cost-effective services to the organization.

**Contract Assignments.** Each contract shall be assigned to a Vice President according to designated portfolios as listed in Table 1, hereafter referred to as the “Designated VP”:

TABLE 1 – CONTRACT ASSIGNMENTS		
CONTRACTOR	SERVICES	DESIGNATED VP
Stefan/George	Association Management	Administration
Stefan/George	Lobbying	Policy and Legislation
Atego Resource	Chapter and Conference Accounting	Administration
New Horizon Enterprise	Association and CM Services for Chapter and Conference	President, Administration, Professional Development
Grandesigns	Newsletter Management and Design	Public Information
Grandesigns	Conference Publication and Design	Conferences
Meetings Xceptional	Conference Management	Administration/Conferences
ThinkReg	Conference Registration (2012 only)	Conferences
Jones McLevitch	Tax Services	Administration
Digital Gear	Website Contractor	Public Information

**Prioritized Contract Review.** All contracts shall be reviewed on a regular basis according to a standardized priority schedule. Priority shall be given to those contracts that are: 1) of largest value; and 2) most significant to the core services and financial integrity of the organization.

## Evaluation Process

1. The Designated VP will notify the President and VP of Administration a minimum of four months prior to contract expiration that review of contract is warranted. The Designated VP, President, and VP of Administration will then perform a performance evaluation and prepare a draft report and recommendation (Draft Report) for consideration by the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors.

In addition to the Designated VP, President, and VP of Administration, other parties will contribute to the evaluation as applicable.

The Executive Director will serve an advisory role on all contracts and will coordinate with the Designated VP and other evaluators in the preparation of the Draft Report.

Outside of the contract review process, APA California will conduct an annual member satisfaction survey to gather input from the membership at large regarding the quality of services and level of benefit the organization is providing. Results from the survey will be considered in the contract review evaluation as applicable.

In the case of the Conference Management contract, the Conference Host Committee and the Standing Conference Committee will be included in the evaluation process. The Conference Host Committee and the Standing Conference Committee will be invited to submit an evaluation report which will be submitted both to the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors.

2. Once the Executive Committee has reviewed and provided input and direction on the Draft Report, the Designated VP will share the evaluation with the contractor who will be given an opportunity to ask questions and provide additional information the contractor believes should be taken into account in the evaluation. New material information will be provided for further review by the Executive Committee.

Should the recommendation be to re-bid the contract, APA California may or may not invite the current contractor to submit a new bid before commencing the bidding process.

3. The final evaluation report and recommendation, and contractor input, will be submitted by the Executive Committee to the Board of Directors for consideration and action.
4. Evaluations are to be performed according to standard criteria that have been established for conducting service satisfaction evaluation and cost-effectiveness analysis for all contracts. The evaluation criteria, listed in Table 2 below, are the benchmarks against which for all contracts are measured to determine the relative merit of the contract and the overall value to APA California. Point-rated criteria identify value-added factors and provide a means to assess and determine whether the contract is best serving the needs of the organization. "Poor performance/value – XX points," "adequate performance/value – XX points" or "strong performance/high value – XX points" of the requirement with an associated score assigned to each mark equivalent.
5. Unsatisfactory results (score of XX or less) will be considered a basis for putting the contract out to bid. In addition, other considerations may warrant consideration for re-bid even for contracts receiving satisfactory marks. Contracts will also routinely be put out to bid to ensure the organization is getting the best market price. The Executive Committee has the authority to assess the cost competitiveness of the contracts and put the contract out for bid.
6. The final decision regarding actions on a contract, which may include re-bidding, extension, or termination, will be made by the Board of Directors considering the evaluation score and additional factors such as institutional knowledge and length of time since contract amount has increased.

TABLE 2 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

CRITERIA		SCORE
Evaluation Scoring: Rate the contractor with scores 3 through 1. 3 = Exceeds Expectations; 2 = Meets Expectations; 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations; N/A = Not Applicable. <b>Detailed comments shall be provided for all scores.</b>		
1	Did the contractor communicate with the Board, Designated VP, and other Board Members, as appropriate to the specific contract, in a manner so as to facilitate effective and efficient decisions?	
2	Did the contractor coordinate and work together with all applicable parties adequately (vs. work independently)?	
3	Was the timeliness of the materials/services rendered acceptable?	
4	Were the services rendered in a professional manner?	
5	Did the materials/services rendered meet contract requirements?	
6	Was the quality of the materials/services rendered acceptable?	
7	Did the services rendered contribute to enhancing the reputation and membership of the organization?	
8	Were services rendered conducted in the best financial interest of the organization?	
9	Do the contract requirements (services rendered) and contract budget provide high value to the organization?	
10	Is the contractor providing materials/services at a competitive price?	
Total Score		_____