

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number:** 240000000494

The Department of Technology, Management & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 240000000698 for the anticipated requirements for the Administration, Scoring and Reporting of Online Statewide Assessments and for providing Student Growth Percentile services. and has recommended an award to Data Recognition Corporation, in the amount of \$92,859,417 pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Melissa Beck, Solicitation Manager.

BeckM3@michigan.gov

517-897-1502

**Background Information:**

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide the development and administration of multiple K–12 student assessment programs, as well as the high-stakes use of the results of those programs for accountability and evaluation purposes. Therefore, the work performed by the Contractor must be of the highest quality and must conform to the most recent Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing as published by the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education. The term of this contract is 5 years, with up to 5 one-year renewal options.

**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on December 18, 2023, for 31 days following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of January 25, 2024.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Measurement Inc.	423 Morris Street, Durham, NC 27701-2128	No	No
Data Recognition Corporation	13490 Bass Lake Road, Maple Grove, MN 55311	No	No

\*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

\*\*GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

# EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

## I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

### Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.1.1 – 1.1.21	110
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2 - 9	15
3.	Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience	5
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet - Experience	20
	<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>

Proposals receiving 120 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

## II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
<b>Katerine Cermak, Test Administration &amp; Reporting Manager/MDE</b>	Andy Middlestead, Director Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability/MDE
<b>John Jaquith, Test Development Manager Office of Educational Assessment &amp; Accountability/MDE</b>	Jason Kolb, Data Integration Specialist/MDE
<b>Jen Paul, English Learner &amp; Accessibility Assessment/MDE</b>	Kaylee Scott, Usability Specialist/MDE
<b>Melissa Beck, Category Analyst/DTMB</b>	Gerry Polverento, Sr. Project Manager & Assessment Specialist/MDE
	Carol Skillings, Finance Manager/MDE
	Tina Foote, DA 12 Secure Site Analyst/MDE
	John Price, Contractor/MDE
	Jessica Fenby, Educational Specialist

Voting	Advisory
	Detra Fields, Director of Teaching & Learning/Carman-Ainsworth Community Schools
	Joy Nakfoor, Category Manager-Services Division/DTMB

### III. Evaluation Results

#### A. Data Recognition Corporation

The Evaluation Team determined that Data Recognition Corporation based on a score of 143, did meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

##### 1. Scheduled A, Statement of Work, Section - 1.1.21

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted (103.5/110).

- a. Overall, on the whole bid response, questions were answered in the wrong spots.
- b. Section 1.1.3 E. 32.f. – Bidder’s response to maintenance periods did not meet the State’s requirement.
- c. Section 1.1.8.5 A-E – Bidder’s response did not provide requested details to meet the requirements.
- d. Section 1.1.13 D 1. – Bidder did not answer question.
- e. Section 1.1.19 E, Data Deliverables - Bidder did not answer questions.

##### 2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2 – 9

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted (14.5/15).

- a. Section 1.2.2 A-D – Bidder did not propose a training targeted towards Assessment Administrators or Proctors or a proposal for ensuring this audience is fully and properly trained for their online tasks.

##### 3. Vendor Questions Worksheet Excluding Experience

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory. (5/5).

##### 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet - Experience

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory. (20/20)

**Total Score: 143/150**

## **B. Measurement Inc.**

The Evaluation Team determined that Measurement Inc., based on a score of 126, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

### **1. Scheduled A, Statement of Work, Section - 1.1.21**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted: (94.5/110)

- a. Overall, on the whole bid response, questions were answered in wrong spots.
  - b. Section 1.1.1 C – Bidder did not answer question 3.
  - c. Section 1.1.2.A. 1 – Bidder did not answer.
  - d. Section 1.1.3.A 3-5 – Bidder did not answer.
  - e. Section 1.1.3 E 1 – 19 – Bidder did not answer all questions.
  - f. Section 1.1.3.E.32
    - 1) c. & d. – Bidder did not answer.
    - 2) f. Bidder’s response to maintenance periods did not meet the State’s requirement.
  - g. Section 1.1.4.C. – Bidder’s response did not describe how they would comply with the requirements.
  - h. Section 1.1.8.A.1 2. – Bidder’s response did not provide requested details to meet the requirements.
  - i. Section 1.1.8.5.A-E – Bidder’s response did not provide requested details to meet the requirements.
  - j. Section 1.1.14.F 2., 3., 6. –
    - 1) 2. Bidder did not address that the Contractor is responsible for Targeted Monitor reimbursement for monitors who are not State of Michigan employees.
    - 2) 3. Bidder did not address that Random Monitors are appointed and reimbursed by the Contractor.
    - 3) 6. Bidder did not address requirement must be reviewed and revised as needed for each assessment cycle.
  - k. Section 1.1.14. G. – Bidder did not address Electronic Files.
  - l. Section 1.1.17. A-B – Bidder excluded math & ELA 8-11, science, SS grade 11 and MI ACCESS F1 for grade 11.
- ### **2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2 – 9**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted: (14.5/15).

- a. Section 1.2.2. F. 11. – Bidder did not address providing student feedback.

**3. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory. (5/5).

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet - Experience**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted: (12/20).

- a. Experiences were out of size and scope.

**Total Score:126/150**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

Selection Criteria		Data Recognition Corporation	Measurement Inc.
<b>1</b>	<b>Section 1 – Section 1.1.1. – 1.1.21 A-C</b>	<b>103.5</b>	<b>94.5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Section 1.2.- 9 A-C SLA</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>14.5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Vendor Question Work – Excluding Experience</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Vendor Questions Worksheet</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>126</b>

**V. Pricing Summary**

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

1st Round Pricing		Data Recognition Corporation	Measurement Incorporated
<b>1</b>	Annual Contract Amount	\$18,944,020.28	\$26,182,428.75
<b>2</b>	Five-Year Contract Amounts	\$94,720,101.40	\$130,912,143.77

**VI. Negotiations**

**Second round pricing:**

2nd Round Pricing		Data Recognition Corporation	Measurement Incorporated
1	Annual Contract Amount	\$18,571,883.41	\$26,144,568.27
2	Five-Year Contract Amounts	\$92,859,417.05	\$130,772,841.35

2nd Round Pricing Savings		Data Recognition Corporation	Measurement Incorporated
		<b>\$2,232,821.22</b>	<b>\$177,162.90</b>

**VII. Award Recommendation**

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

Data Recognition Corporation provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include having a special education department, owning its own printing, having advanced Receiving and Check-in of Print Materials, providing automation and barcode scanners to find any discrepancies, having Quality Control rescan automation to be matched against previous scanned information, a robust website for educator video testimonials and communication resources and accepting the State’s Standard Contract Terms as identified in the RFP.

As part of the best value determination amongst bidders overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered in making this award. Data Recognition Corporation provides the greatest overall economic impact to Michigan because they have an office in East Lansing, Michigan which supports this contract.

Award Recommendation is made to Data Recognition Corporation in the amount of \$92,859,417.