

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

## Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000169

The Department of Technology, Management & Budget (DTMB) office has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal 200000002183 for Administration, Scoring, and Reporting of Assessments for Grades 8 – 11, including College Entrance Examination and has recommended an award to College Board in the amount of \$44,070,000.00, 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:

Jillian Yeates, Solicitation Manager.

yeatesj@michigan.gov

517-275-1131

### Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide administration, scoring, and reporting of assessments for Grades 8 – 11, including College Entrance Examination for the Michigan Department of Education (MDE). The term of this contract is 5 years, with up to 5, 1-year renewal options.

### Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on Monday, May 9, 2022, for a period of four and a half weeks. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of Thursday, June 9, 2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
ACT, Inc.	500 ACT Drive, Iowa City, IA 52243	N/A
College Board	250 Vesey St., New York, NY 10281	N/A

\*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

# 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.	Work and Deliverables – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2	25
2.	Implementation Activities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3	25
3.	IT Related Requirements – Schedule A, Sections 1.8 – 1.16	10
4.	Project Management – Schedule A, Section 5	15
5.	Contract Activities – Schedule A, except for Sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.8 – 1.16, and Section 5	10
6.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	15
	<b>Total</b>	100

Proposals receiving 80 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 a Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC), which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Jillian Yeates, Solicitation Manager DTMB/Central Procurement Services	Gerry Polverento, MDE Sr. Project Manager MDE/OEAA
Kate Cermak, Test Administration and Reporting Manager MDE/OEAA	Jessica Fenby, Assessment Integrity and Security Administrator MDE/OEAA
John Jaquith, Test Development Manager MDE/OEAA	Andrew Middlestead, OEAA Director MDE/OEAA

Voting	Advisory
<b>Steve Reed, MME Test Administration and Reporting Consultant</b> <b>MDE/OEAA</b>	
<b>Jen Paul, English Learner &amp; Accessibility Assessment Specialist</b> <b>MDE/OEAA</b>	
<b>Jonathan Flukes, Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Consultant</b> <b>Oakland Schools/District and School Services, Curriculum and Assessment</b>	
<b>Brad Hale, Principal</b> <b>Brown City Jr/Sr High School</b>	

### III. Evaluation Results

#### A. ACT, Inc. (ACT)

The Evaluation Team determined that ACT, based on a score of 81, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their original responses, prior to clarifications, to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

##### 1. Work and Deliverables – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2 (23/25)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.2.A.1) c): The Bidder does not provide the number of test forms, claiming proprietary and confidential information, however, the Bidder had the option to outline confidential and proprietary information in the Confidential Treatment Form when submitting their proposal but chose not to exercise this option.
- b. Section 1.2 A. 5): The alignment study the Bidder provides links the assessments with ELA, Mathematics, and Science standards, but does not directly link to Social Studies standards as listed in the requirement of this Section of the RFP.
- c. Section 1.2. B. 1) g): Students using accommodations are not college reportable which does not meet the requirement in this Section of the RFP.
- d. Section 1.2. B. 2): Uncontracted Braille (UEB), is currently not offered in the assessment.

##### 2. Implementation Activities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3 (17/25)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly acceptable, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.3. D.: While the Bidder provides that they will use the manage participation process for test establishment, the Bidder does not describe what this process contains or looks like in order for the evaluation team to determine how the Bidder will meet the requirement in this Section of the RFP.
- b. Section 1.3. G. 1) b) 2): The Bidder takes an exception to this requirement that requires investigation details and plan must be presented to OEAA within 1 business day and proposes to provide the information within 30 business days which does not meet the requirement of this Section nor the needs of the State for call center issues.
- c. Section 1.3. G. 2): The Bidder meets the call center requirements for the College Entrance level assessment; however, the Bidder does not meet the requirements for the Pre-College Entrance Assessment for grades 8-10. The Call Center hours do not start until 9:30 a.m. and the State requirement is 8:00 a.m.
- d. Section 1.3. G. 2) a): The Bidder agrees to the extended time request for some days during the test administration window for the College Entrance level assessment for during the test administration; however, the Bidder provides a shortened time period for the entire test window. In addition, the Bidder fails to address the testing windows and extended hours of support for the Pre-College Entrance administration.
- e. Section 1.3. K. 1) c) 2.: The Bidder provides an exception to the requirement. The Bidder will not be able to support the requirement of retrieving accommodation information directly from the OEAA Secure Site.
- f. Section 1.3. K. 3) b): The Bidder provides Secure materials for ACT to be shipped one week prior to the testing which does not meet the State requirement of no later than two weeks prior to testing.
- g. Section 1.3. K. 3) c): While the Bidder discusses their shipping plans and what providers and processes would look like, the Bidder does not provide details regarding how the tracking information will be uploaded into the OEAA Secure Site for schools and district staff to have accessibility as required in this Section of the RFP.
- h. Section 1.3. N. 3): The Bidder provides an exception to the requirement regarding disclosing the number of site monitoring visits as required in this Section of the RFP.
- i. Section 1.3. N. 4): The Bidder provides an exception to the signed security compliance agreement forms requirement that all school test coordinators complete for both print and online, which does not meet the needs of the State for this Section of the RFP.
- j. Section 1.3. P. 6): The Bidder provides an exception to this requirement and will not meet all the requirements in this Section of the RFP, which does not meet the needs of the State.

- k. Section 1.3. Q. 1): The Bidder's response to this Section does not fully detail or provide enough information regarding specific items of Forensic Analysis and how the Bidder will meet the specific requirements regarding analysis for this Section of the RFP.
  - l. Section 1.3. S. 2) f): The Bidder provides an exception to this Section regarding not reporting back to the State student item level data as required in this Section of the RFP.
  - m. Section 1.3 T. 17) (36 in the RFP): The Bidder does not currently support iPads for System Architecture.
  - n. Section 1.3. T. 28) (47 in the RFP): The Bidder cannot currently support the requirement that the system must implement Transport Layer Security version 1.2 or higher using federally compliant encryption or an equivalent federally approved encryption method for transmission of data.
- 3. IT Related Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.8 – 1.16 (9/10)**  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:
- a. Section 1.13: the Bidder does not agree to meet the RTO requirement of 24 hours.
- 4. Project Management – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5 (15/15)**  
The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements in this Section with no exceptions.
- 5. Contract Activities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, except for Sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.8 – 1.16, and Section 5 (2/10)**  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were not satisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 1.1 A. 1): The Bidder's response does not properly reflect the high stakes nature required by this RFP for the PreACT exams in grades 8, 9, and 10. The exams offered in these grade levels are state required exams and warrant the same test security practices as the ACT in grade 11. The exam in 8<sup>th</sup> grade is also used for federal accountability purposes and current PreACT responses would unlikely be deemed acceptable by federal peer review.
  - b. 1.7.6.: The Bidder does not agree to this requirement, the Bidder states that they will provide material five days prior to rather than 14. In addition, the Bidder's response indicates that the material provided will not have the flexibility for State input.
  - c. Section 2.1.B.: The Bidder does not agree to time frames and provides exceptions to both the Monthly Call Center Detail report deadline and the weekly call center report deadline.

- d. Section 3.1.: The Bidder does not expressly agree to the requirements in this Section for acceptance of contract activities.
  - e. Section 4.6.: The Bidder is not able to meet the work hours as described in this Section of the RFP.
  - f. Sections 9. and 10.: The Bidder does not expressly agree to either the Liquidated Damages Section or the Service Level Agreement Section.
6. Vendor Questions Worksheet (15/15)  
The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements in this Section with no exceptions.

**Total Score: 81/100**

## **B. College Board**

The Evaluation Team determined that College Board based on a score of 87, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their original responses, prior to clarifications, to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. Work and Deliverables – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2 (24/25)  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Section 1.2. A. 3) f): While the Bidder provides descriptions of criterion-referenced reporting, the Bidder does not provide samples of the reporting as required in this Section of the RFP.
  - b. 1.2. A. 5): The alignment study links the assessments with ELA and mathematics standards but does not directly link Social Studies or Science Standards.
  - c. 1.2. B. 1) g): Students using accommodations are not college reportable which does not meet the requirement in this Section of the RFP.
  - d. 1.2. B. 2): Uncontracted Braille (UEB), is currently not offered in the assessment.
- 2. Implementation Activities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3 (18/25)  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. 1.3. G. 2): The Bidder provides an exception and cannot meet the 8:00 a.m. requirement, however the Bidder will be available at 8:30 a.m.
  - b. 1.3. G. 2.) b): The Bidder commits to “average daily speed of answer” of 4 minutes or less which does not meet the requirement of all calls must not wait for more than four minutes, in this Section of the RFP.
  - c. 1.3. G. 3) c): The Bidder does not provide a document that contained approved answers as attachments as required in this Section of the RFP.

- d. 1.3. I. 2): The Bidder does not include what customization options they could provide to make manuals Michigan specific, rather only that they would work with the State to create them. This Section required a response that included the available options for customization, therefore, the Bidder does not meet this requirement in this Section of the RFP.
- e. 1.3. J. 1) d) 3.: The Bidder's response provides an exception to the requirement involving printing and utilizing PreID labels as described in this Section of the RFP.
- f. 1.3. K. 1) c) 2.: The Bidder provides an exception to the requirement. The Bidder will not be able to support the requirement of retrieving accommodation information directly from the OEAA Secure Site.
- g. 1.3. M. 1) a) 2.: The Bidder's response does not include specific details required or enough information for the Evaluation team to determine how they would meet the requirement in this Section of the RFP.
- h. 1.3. O. 2) f): The Bidder's response provides an exception to this requirement stating that this is not needed, however, the Bidder indicates in other responses that there will be materials shipped back to them, therefore this requirement should have addressed additional procedures for QAP as required in this Section of the RFP.
- i. 1.3. P.: The Bidder does not provide machine scorable answer documents which results in several requirements throughout this Section not being met. In addition, the Bidder does not describe their alternative solution with enough detail and information for the Evaluation Team to determine if the alternative would meet the needs of the State.
- j. 1.3. Q. 1): The Bidder's response to this Section does not fully detail or provide enough information regarding specific items of Forensic Analysis and how the Bidder will meet the specific requirements regarding analysis for this Section of the RFP.
- k. 1.3. S. 2) f): The Bidder provides an exception to this Section regarding not reporting back to the State student item level data as required in this Section of the RFP.

**3. IT Related Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.8 – 1.16 (9/10)**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Section 1.13: the Bidder does not agree to meet the RTO requirement of 24 hours.
- 4. Project Management – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5 (15/15)**  
 The Evaluation Team determined the Bidder met all requirements of this Section with no exception.



**5. Contract Activities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, except for Sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.8 – 1.16, and Section 5 (6/10)**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were partially satisfactory, and the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. 1.1. A.: The Bidder does not meet the State requirement of having a paper/pencil assessment available, rather the Bidder only will provide a paper/pencil assessment as a form of accommodation and other specific circumstances. This does not meet the requirement for this RFP.
- b. Section 4.5.: The Bidder does not provide a Technical Support, Repairs, and Maintenance number in their response as requested for this Section of the RFP.
- c. Sections 9. and 10.: The Bidder does not expressly agree to either the Liquidated Damages Section or the Service Level Agreement Section.

**6. Vendor Questions Worksheet (15/15)**

The Evaluation Team determined the Bidder met all requirements of this Section with no exception.

**Total Score:87/100**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

Technical Evaluation Criteria		Weight	College Board	
			ACT, Inc	College Board
1	Work and Deliverables - Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2	25	23	24
2	Implementation Activities - Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3	25	17	18
3	IT Related Requirements - Schedule A, Sections 1.8 - 1.16	10	9	9
4	Project Management - Schedule A, Section 5	15	15	15
5	Contract Activities - Schedule A, except for Sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.8 - 1.16, and 5	10	2	6
6	Vendor Questions Worksheet	15	15	15
<b>Total</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>87</b>



### I. Pricing Summary

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

	<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>ACT</b>	<b>College Board</b>
<b>1</b>	Total Cost for College Entrance Examination	\$23,686,383.87	\$24,270,000.00
<b>2</b>	Total Cost for Pre-College Entrance Examination	\$24,743,335.43	\$19,800,000.00
	<b>Total Price</b>	<b>\$48,429,719.30*</b>	<b>\$44,070,000.00</b>

\*ACT pricing does not include costs for a written portion of the examination.

### II. Negotiations

Additional Pricing clarifications and rounds were conducted with both Bidders who passed technical.

### III. 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.

College Board provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: Secure testing standards for both the College and Pre-College examinations and availability of customer service hours.

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered and is not a determinative factor in making this award.

Award Recommendation is made to College Board in the amount of \$44,070,000.00.