SITKA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL AFFILIATION REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS May 2, 2018

| SCH Affiliation RFP | | | SCC | RES | | | | | |
|---|-------|------|---------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---|
| Criteria / Component | Brady | Cave | Huebner | Evaluator 4 | Evaluator 5 | Avg Weight | Qualitative Adjustment | COMBINED SCORE* | v |
| Degree to which RFP respondent's vision for SCH optimizes SCH's positive attributes outlined in the "Introduction" section of the RFP: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | |
| Mission and Vision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Critical Access Hospital status | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Programs and services that enhance the continuum of care in the community (outpatient services, swing bed program, long-term care, home health) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Employment of talented mix of providers and staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 2. RFP respondent's demonstrated willingness to embrace the Assembly's Guiding Principles and Goals of Affiliation (refer to "Objectives and Priorities" section of RFP, as well as "Prioritized Goals and Guiding Principles" document): | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | |
| Guiding Principles: | | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Alignment of organizational missions and core values | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 2) Compatibility of culture embracing quality and accountability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Commitment to serving local community and providing access to appropriate care close to home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 4) Adoption of shared vision for the future | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Relationships characterized by trust, integrity, equity and collaborative spirit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Transparency and open communication channels between all parties | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 7) Willingness to engage mutually in transition/integration planning | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Prioritized Goals (green=high priority; blue=lower priority): | | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Increase quality and scope of healthcare provided in Sitka | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 2) Mitigate current and future liabilities to CBS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 3) Maintain/expand living wage employment opportunities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 4) Provide access to capital for future needed improvements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 5) Participate in governance of future affiliated entity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| 6) Elevate brand status and reputation within our community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

| 3. Assessment of best organizational fit, along with benefit to SCH and the community, based on the RFP respondent's response to "Characteristics of | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|--|
| Proposer" and proposal requirements outlined in "Phase 1" section of the RFP: | | | | | | | | |
| A demonstrated culture of quality and accountability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| A proven track record of operational success | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Capabilities, facilities, clinical integration, leadership, and strategies to position the organization for healthcare reform | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Demonstrated history of following through on its promises and commitments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Proposer's history with and reputation among physicians, consumers, and third-party payers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Experience with and proposed strategies for improving patient experience and outcomes and third-party payers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Financial strength of the proposer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 4. Degree to which the nature and structure of the proposed affiliation (see proposal requirements outlined in "Phase 1" section of the RFP) aligns with the Assembly's Prioritized Goals of Affiliation and supports long-term sustainability of care in the community. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | | |
| 5. Any other criteria that consultants and CBS staff deems important in assessing RFP respondents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | | |

^{*} Combined Score = Sum of Individual Scores x Average Weight + Qualitative Adjustment

For all respondents, please answer the following question: Is there something that would make this a stronger proposal?

| Rating Scale: 1-5 | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1-Does not meet criterion | |
| 2-Partially meets criterion | |
| 3-Adequately meets criterion | |
| 4-Exceeds criterion | |
| 5-Greatly exceeds criterion | |