



Solicitation No.: 16-ERC-AT2-0026
 Solicitation Title: Texas E-Procurement System (E-Procurement)
 Evaluation Period: December 6, 2016 - December 11, 2017
 Final Version: Final Version

Purpose: To facilitate the documentation of the evaluation committee's scoring of proposals prepared from prospective vendors for the following solicitation.
 Applicability: This tool applies to the procurement of goods and services other than public works (construction services) and professional services or contracts.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Criteria (Refer to Scoring Guide)	Weight (%)	American	Native	Total	Total
			Preference Points (Total Average)	Preference Points (Total Average)	PT Points (Total Average)	Points (Total Average)
Evaluation Criteria: Cost of E-Procurement System and Services	<p>Vendor's proposed price of E-Procurement system and services from Attachment C - Proposed Pricing. (TOTAL MAX 26 POINTS)</p> <p>SCORING GUIDE:</p> <p>Highly Cost-Effective (MAX 26 POINTS) Vendors will receive competitive, reasonable, and alignment with project requirements. Proposals that clearly specify eligible and ineligible costs and demonstrate cost efficiency will receive higher scores. The following formula will be used to determine cost points for scoring when applicable.</p> <p>Formula: General Proposed Price / (Proposed Price x Assigned Point)</p> <p>Example: Price Proposal and scoring needs based on a 30-point scale: Proposed Price Scale Proposal A \$10,000.00 -> (\$10,000.00 / \$10,000.00) x 30 = 30 pts Proposal B \$15,000.00 -> (\$15,000.00 / \$15,000.00) x 30 = 20 pts Proposal C \$20,000.00 -> (\$20,000.00 / \$20,000.00) x 30 = 15 pts</p> <p>This scoring method assigns a flat assessment of proposals based on their pricing relative to the lowest bid.</p>	30%	9.20	19.87	22.07	26.00
Evaluation Criteria: Technical & Functional Suitability	<p>Technical & Functional Suitability (MAX 20 POINTS) Vendors will assess how well the proposed goods and/or services meet the district's needs. This includes, but is not limited to technical specifications, functional requirements, and service expectations as outlined in the RFP. Emphasis will be placed on the vendor's ability to fulfill core needs, offer value-added features, and engage effectively within the district's existing infrastructure or operations. Proposals that demonstrate a strong fit with the district's requirements and clearly address key performance expectations will score higher. Vendors that fail to meet the minimum mandatory requirements may receive reduced points under this criterion and will not be eligible for the full 20 points.</p> <p>Criteria to Consider: - Alignment with technical specifications and functional requirements outlined in the RFP. - Ability to meet or exceed mandatory and performance-based requirements. - Inclusion of value-added features that enhance functionality or efficiency. - Compatibility with existing systems, infrastructure, and operational workflows.</p> <p>Scoring Guidelines: 18-20 points: Proposal fully meets or exceeds technical specifications, functional requirements, and service expectations; clearly fulfills core needs; integrates seamlessly with existing systems; and provides meaningful value-added features. 16-17 points: Proposal meets most technical specifications, functional requirements, and service expectations with only minor gaps; demonstrates strong alignment with core needs and overall compatibility with existing systems. 14-15 points: Proposal addresses baseline technical requirements but shows gaps in meeting functional or performance expectations; provides limited added value or contains compatibility with existing infrastructure. 8-9 points: Proposal does not meet key technical specifications or functional requirements; fails to demonstrate compatibility with existing systems; or lacks alignment with the district's core needs.</p>	20%	15.60	19.20	11.80	12.60
Evaluation Criteria: Reputation & Reliability	<p>Reputation & Reliability (MAX 12 POINTS) Evaluators will consider the vendor's demonstrated reliability and reputation based on the references provided within each proposal. This may include, but is not limited to, third-party industry benchmarks, independent analyst reports, documented past performance, and overall professional standing in the marketplace. The evaluation will also reflect the vendor's proven track record in delivering high-quality goods and/or services relevant to the scope of this RFP, as demonstrated through past performance and relevant experience.</p> <p>Criteria to Consider: - Proven track record of success in similar engagements or contracts. - Independent verification of reliability (e.g., analyst reviews, security certifications, awards). - References from previous clients, case studies, or documented successes. - General reputation in the industry for service quality, responsiveness, and integrity.</p> <p>Scoring Guidelines: 12-14 points: Vendor has a strong, well-documented reputation with excellent references and independent recognition for performance and reliability. 9-11 points: Vendor has a positive reputation with solid references and some third-party validation; minor gaps may exist in documentation or breadth of recognition. 8 points: Vendor has a generally acceptable reputation but lacks sufficient documentation or has limited third-party recognition. 4 points: Vendor has little to no demonstrated reputation or has documented issues related to reliability or performance.</p>	14%	8.40	13.60	10.20	10.60
Evaluation Criteria: Total Cost of Ownership	<p>Total Cost of Ownership (MAX 10 POINTS) Total long-term costs to acquire, implement, maintain, and support the proposed goods and/or services. Evaluators will assess the total ineligible cost to the district over the full term of the agreement, including but not limited to all applicable fees such as implementation, licensing, support, maintenance, and renewal costs. Vendors must provide a complete and transparent cost breakdown of eligible versus ineligible costs in their RFP responses. Proposals with acceptable, inclusive, or transparent pricing may receive reduced scores, as evaluators must be able to accurately determine the full financial impact to the district.</p> <p>Criteria to Consider: - Total ineligible cost over the full three-year term. - Inclusion of all relevant costs (e.g., licensing, implementation, support, maintenance, renewals). - Transparency and completeness of cost breakdown. - Pricing flexibility and cost-efficiency relative to other proposals.</p> <p>Scoring Guidelines: 7-10 points: Proposal includes all required costs in a clear and detailed manner; offers competitive pricing; and provides flexible licensing or cost-saving options. 5-6 points: Proposal is generally complete and competitively priced, with only minor issues in clarity or transparency. 4-5 points: Proposal has moderate pricing or structure issues, such as incomplete cost elements or less competitive rates. 3 points: Proposal is unclear, lacks key cost components, or reflects significantly higher costs without justification.</p>	10%	5.20	9.80	6.00	5.80
Evaluation Criteria: Quality of Proposed Goods and/or Services	<p>Quality of Proposed Goods and/or Services (MAX 10 POINTS) Evaluators will assess the overall quality, functionality, and suitability of the proposed goods and/or services in relation to the district's specified needs.</p> <p>Criteria to Consider: - Overall quality and suitability of the proposed goods and/or services. - Suitability and alignment with the district's functional and technical requirements. - Vendor's experience and history of delivering similar solutions successfully. - Evidence of performance from past projects (e.g., case studies, testimonials, etc.).</p> <p>Scoring Guidelines: 7-10 points: Proposal demonstrates high-quality goods and/or services that fully align with the district's needs, supported by a strong track record of relevant and successful implementations. 5-6 points: Vendor has a positive reputation with solid references and some third-party validation; minor gaps may exist in documentation or breadth of recognition. 4-5 points: Proposal meets minimum quality expectations but may show moderate gaps in alignment, functionality, or evidence of performance. 3 points: Proposal lacks sufficient quality, contains significant shortcomings in suitability, or lacks a proven track record of successful delivery.</p>	10%	6.20	9.40	5.80	5.60
Evaluation Criteria: Terms & Conditions	<p>Terms & Conditions (MAX 8 POINTS) Vendor's proposed contract terms and conditions. When evaluating the vendor's proposed contract terms and conditions, overall key criteria will be considered: the initial commencement date and renewal options, service availability, bandwidth increase terms, early termination clause, and price stability. Each of these elements is essential in ensuring the overall suitability of the vendor's proposal. A well-structured contract that effectively addresses these criteria can offer the necessary stability and flexibility while ensuring service continuity. The offeror agrees to IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions and provides, in writing, any exceptions to any of the terms.</p> <p>Criteria to Consider: - Alignment of contract commencement date and renewal options with district needs. - Clarity and stability of service availability commitments. - Flexibility and fairness of bandwidth increase terms. - Reasonableness of early termination provisions. - Stability of pricing and resistance against unexpected cost increases. - Vendor's acceptance of IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions, with minimal or no exceptions provided in writing.</p> <p>Scoring Guidelines: 7-8 points: Proposal fully aligns with IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions, with no or minimal exceptions; contract terms clearly support stability, flexibility and service continuity. 5-6 points: Proposal aligns with IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions with minor exceptions; overall contract terms are reasonable and adequately address key criteria. 4-5 points: Proposal contains moderate exceptions to IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions; some contract terms are unclear, restrictive, or provide limited stability. 3 points: Proposal includes significant exceptions to IDEA's General & Supplemental Terms and Conditions; contract terms fail to address key criteria or do not support the district's service continuity and stability needs.</p>	10%	6.40	9.60	8.20	8.00
Evaluation Criteria: Completeness of Proposal	<p>Completeness of Proposal (MAX 5 POINTS) Proposals will be evaluated on the inclusion of all required elements in accordance with the submission guidelines. This criterion assesses whether the offeror has followed all instructions, provided full and responsive answers to every section of the RFP, and demonstrated the ability to meet all stated requirements.</p> <p>Criteria to Consider: - Inclusion of all required forms, documents, and attachments as outlined in the RFP. - Responsiveness to every section of the RFP, with clear and complete answers. - Adherence to submission instructions, formatting requirements, and deadlines. - Overall organization and clarity of the proposal submission.</p> <p>Scoring Guidelines: 5 points: Proposal is fully complete, follows all submission guidelines, includes all required documents, and provides clear and comprehensive responses. 4 points: Proposal is substantially complete with only minor omissions or minor non-responses; responses are generally clear and align with requirements. 2-3 points: Proposal contains noticeable omissions, incomplete responses, or deviations from submission guidelines; overall responsiveness is limited. 1 point: Proposal is incomplete, missing key required documents or sections, and fails to follow submission guidelines.</p>	5%	4.20	5.00	3.80	3.40
Evaluation Criteria: Responsiveness of Offeror	<p>Responsiveness of Offeror (MAX 5 POINTS) Evaluating the responsiveness of the Offeror through the lens of proximity and local representation allows IDEA Public Schools to identify vendors who can provide timely, effective, and tailored support. Local or proximity-based representation can facilitate communication, quicker on-site response when needed, and a stronger understanding of local conditions and requirements. This criterion assesses that potential vendors demonstrate both operational readiness and commitment to partnership success through accessible and reliable service.</p> <p>Criteria to Consider: - Proximity of vendor office and/or service staff to IDEA campus and facilities. - Availability of local vendor representation or regional account managers for timely coordination. - Demonstrated ability to respond promptly to requests, service calls, and project adjustments. - Evidence of established local support infrastructure (e.g., service technicians, distribution hubs, or client success teams). - Overall clarity, organization, and timeliness of communication during the procurement process.</p> <p>Scoring Guidelines: 5 points: Offeror maintains a strong local presence and demonstrates clear, timely, and proactive communication. Response structure, accessibility, and support readiness exceed expectations. 3-4 points: Offeror shows partial local representation and moderate responsiveness; communications were adequate but inconsistent or delayed. 1 point: Offeror's proposal lacks local presence or demonstrates limited capacity for timely communication or support.</p>	5%	3.40	4.60	4.00	3.80
Evaluation Criteria: Compliance with Laws and Ethically Sourced Businesses	<p>Impact on the Ability to Comply with Laws and Ethically Sourced Businesses (PASS/FAIL - POINTS WEIGHTED) This criterion will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis. Offerors should demonstrate compliance with Texas Education Code and IDEA's commitment to supplier diversity by showing active engagement with Minority- and Women-Owned Business Enterprises (MWBEs). This documentation reflects an offeror's commitment to equitable participation, local economic development, and adherence to procurement standards promoting inclusion.</p> <p>Criteria to Consider: - Documentation of certification as a Minority- and/or Women-Owned Business Enterprise (MWBE). - Submission of at least two certified MWBE subcontractor references. - Evidence of a past contract agreement with a certified MWBE firm. - A diverse list of certified MWBE subcontractors, subcontractors, or suppliers participating in the proposed contract.</p> <p>Scoring Guidelines: - PASS: Offeror provided complete documentation demonstrating certification and/or engagement with MWBEs in accordance with Texas Education Code and IDEA Public Schools' procurement policies. - FAIL: Offeror did not provide sufficient documentation to verify MWBE certification, partnership, or subcontractor participation.</p>	PASS/FAIL	Fail	Pass	Fail	Fail
Total		100%				
Grand Totals			80.60	90.87	71.87	76.20