

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** June 1, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Jesolyn Larry, Interim Info.Technology Officer**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☒ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☐ Contract Extension
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 12-03-09-01

Agenda Item: 16-24-10-23
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a new contract with Xerox Corporation to provide the operation and maintenance of the Print Shop and all the District's multi-functional devices for the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a reduced cost of (25%) not to exceed \$1,200,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

This a new contract with with Xerox Corporation. The monthly amount is a 25% reduction from the previous contract. The District was satisfied with the quality of the services received. Previously, the District paid approximately \$150,000 per month for services which include: fleet management of the multi-functional print/copier devices, District-wide Pony and US mail delivery services in elementary, middle, high schools and administrative offices as well as daily management of the Print Shop.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 93**MSIP:** 6.4.1**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 110-2577-6319-981-00	GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$1,200,000.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$1,200,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600004465

Department: Technology**Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director****Requestor:** J.F. Larry**Dr. Jesolyn Larry, Interim Info.Technology Officer****Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer****Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**

SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: May 28, 2010

To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

From: Dr. Jesolyn Larry, Interim Info.Technology Officer

VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:

- ☒ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☐ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 09-06-07-06

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-24
Information: ☐
Conference: ☐
Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract with Dell Corporation as the standard vendor for technology purchases for items such as, personal laptops, desktops, tablet computers, servers, storage devices and peripherals, for the period beginning July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 with a possible renewal for 2 additional years.

BACKGROUND:

This project encompasses entering into a contractual agreement with Dell Corporation for standardization and direct purchase of servers, storage devices, peripherals, desktop, notebook and laptop computers. The contract requires that Dell image, install and deliver all units. Dell is a diversified information supplier that sells numerous products directly to its customers. This direct model allows the building of each system to order and ensures that the District receives systems configured to specifications at highly competitive prices.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance

Row: 93

MSIP: 6.4.1

FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source:	GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$ 0.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600005394


Department: Technology


Requestor: J.F. Larry


Dr. Jesolyn Larry, Interim Info.Technology Officer


Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: 5-27-2010
Dept / School: Information Technology		Reported By: J. F. Larry
Vendor: Tyler Technologies		Vendor #: 600013770
Contract # / P.O/ #: 4500149292/4500148881/4500149614		Contract Name:
Contract Amount: \$ 402,000.00		Award Date: 7-21-09
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): To provide the District's Student Information System which is the authoritative source for the collection and reporting of student data.		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 4 X 3 2 1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 4 X 3 2 1	
Business Relations	5 4 X 3 2 1	
Customer Satisfaction	5 4 X 3 2 1	
Cost Control	5 4 3 X 2 1	
Average Score	3.8	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.



Must purchase
internet service -
Not a viable option.

SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910

Purchase and Installation of Computers

EVALUATION DATE: 5.25.10
VENDOR: AT+T
TOTAL COMBINED POINTS: _____

Total points in an evaluation area should be averaged from all evaluators. For example, if there are five evaluators their rating should be averaged, i.e., total points of all five evaluators divided by the number of evaluators

1. Vendor's experience working with the District -- 10

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>6</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>24</u>	<u>Avg</u> <u>4.8</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>6</u>		
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>4</u>		
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>6</u>		
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>2</u>		

2. Submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>2.2</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>2</u>		
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>		

3. Company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1.6</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>1</u>		
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>		
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>		

4. Vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1.6</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>1</u>		
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>		
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>		

5. Cost of switching vendors -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

Total
8

Avg
1.6

6. Firm's warranty Program -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

9

1.8

7. MWBE Participation -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

10

2

8. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise -- 10

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 4
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 6
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 6
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 6
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 2

24

4.8

9. Use of P-Card -- 10

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 6
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 6
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 10
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 2

26

5.2

10. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness -- 40

Evaluator #1 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #2 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #3 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #4 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #5 Total Points: _____



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-8-10

VENDOR: AT&T

EVALUATOR #: Dave Lashbrook

#1

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense

<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)				
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2 4 6 8 10

5. Use of P-Card (10)				
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> no or non-response	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some expense	<input type="checkbox"/> limited expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No cost or additional expense involved

2 4 6 8 10

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)	
Total Cost -	



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: _____

VENDOR: HT&J Netbook only

EVALUATOR #: 2

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards


2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> Insufficient Response <input type="radio"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="radio"/> Meets Standards <input type="radio"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="radio"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="radio"/> no or non-response <input type="radio"/> Expensive <input type="radio"/> some expense <input type="radio"/> limited expense <input type="radio"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-9-10

VENDOR: AT&T

EVALUATOR #: 3

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)

Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☒ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)

Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☒ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☒ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.

Quality Rating

☒ Very Expensive ☒ Expensive ☐ Some Expense ☐ Minimal Expense ☐ No Expense

Evaluate the firm's warranty program.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)

Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)

Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)

Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing

Quality Rating

☐ no or non-response ☐ Expensive ☒ some expense ☐ limited expense ☐ No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)

Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4/7/10

VENDOR: AT&T

EVALUATOR #: Samell Wren
#4

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> Insufficient Response <input type="radio"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="radio"/> Meets Standards <input type="radio"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="radio"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> no or non-response <input type="radio"/> Expensive <input type="radio"/> some expense <input type="radio"/> limited expense <input checked="" type="radio"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 5/24/10

VENDOR: AT&T

EVALUATOR #: 5

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)

Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)

Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.

Quality Rating

☒ Very Expensive ☐ Expensive ☐ Some Expense ☐ Minimal Expense ☐ No Expense

Evaluate the firm's warranty program.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)

Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)

Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)

Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing

Quality Rating

☒ no or non-response ☐ Expensive ☐ some expense ☐ limited expense ☐ No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)

Total Cost - Bid was incomplete - did not address all needs from RFP



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910

Purchase and Installation of Computers

EVALUATION DATE: 5.25.10
VENDOR: HP
TOTAL COMBINED POINTS: 75.6

Total points in an evaluation area should be averaged from all evaluators. For example, if there are five evaluators their rating should be averaged, i.e., total points of all five evaluators divided by the number of evaluators

1. Vendor's experience working with the District -- 10

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>6</u>

Total
26

Avg
5.2

2. Submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>5</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>3</u>

18

3.6

3. Company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>3</u>

15

3

4. Vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>3</u>

16

3.2

5. Cost of switching vendors -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>3</u>

Total
12

Avg
2.4

6. Firm's warranty Program -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>3</u>

15

3

7. MWBE Participation -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>2</u>

12

2.4

8. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise -- 10

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>8</u>

32

6.4

9. Use of P-Card -- 10

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>10</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>8</u>


32

6.4

10. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness -- 40

Evaluator #1	Total Points: _____
Evaluator #2	Total Points: _____
Evaluator #3	Total Points: _____
Evaluator #4	Total Points: _____
Evaluator #5	Total Points: _____

} 40 - note book



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-8-10

VENDOR: HP

EVALUATOR #: Dave Lashbrook
#1

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense	
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

3. MWBE Participation (5)					
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> Insufficient Response <input type="radio"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="radio"/> Meets Standards <input type="radio"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="radio"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> no or non-response <input type="radio"/> Expensive <input checked="" type="radio"/> some expense <input type="radio"/> limited expense <input type="radio"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: _____

VENDOR: H. P.

EVALUATOR #: 2

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> Insufficient Response <input type="radio"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="radio"/> Meets Standards <input type="radio"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="radio"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="radio"/> no or non-response <input type="radio"/> Expensive <input type="radio"/> some expense <input type="radio"/> limited expense <input type="radio"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-9-10

VENDOR: HP

EVALUATOR #: 3

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)

Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)

Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing

Quality Rating

☐ no or non-response ☐ Expensive ☒ some expense ☐ limited expense ☐ No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)

Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4/9/10

VENDOR: HP

EVALUATOR #: Samell Wren

#4

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)

Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.

Quality Rating

Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)

Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.

Quality Rating

Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☒ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.

Quality Rating

Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.

Quality Rating

Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☒ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.

Quality Rating

☒ Very Expensive ☐ Expensive ☐ Some Expense ☒ Minimal Expense ☐ No Expense

Evaluate the firm's warranty program.

Quality Rating

Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☒ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)

Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.

Quality Rating

Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> Insufficient Response <input type="radio"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="radio"/> Meets Standards <input type="radio"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="radio"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> no or non-response <input type="radio"/> Expensive <input type="radio"/> some expense <input type="radio"/> limited expense <input checked="" type="radio"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 5/24/10

VENDOR: HP

EVALUATOR #: 5

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
Insufficient Response — Marginal Response Meets Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
no or non-response — Expensive some expense <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> limited expense No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost - 30



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910

Purchase and Installation of Computers

EVALUATION DATE: 5.25.10

VENDOR: Dell

TOTAL COMBINED POINTS: 80.54

Total points in an evaluation area should be averaged from all evaluators. For example, if there are five evaluators their rating should be averaged, i.e., total points of all five evaluators divided by the number of evaluators

1. Vendor's experience working with the District -- 10

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>10</u>	Total 42	Avg 8.4
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>6</u>		
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>8</u>		
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>10</u>		
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>8</u>		

2. Submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>4</u>	18	3.6
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>4</u>		
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>4</u>		

3. Company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>3</u>	16	3.2
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>4</u>		
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>3</u>		

4. Vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>3</u>	16	3.2
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>3</u>		
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>4</u>		
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>3</u>		

5. Cost of switching vendors -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 5
 Evaluator #2 Total Points: 5
 Evaluator #3 Total Points: 4
 Evaluator #4 Total Points: 4
 Evaluator #5 Total Points: 3

Total
21

Avg
4.2

6. Firm's warranty Program -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 4
 Evaluator #2 Total Points: 3
 Evaluator #3 Total Points: 3
 Evaluator #4 Total Points: 4
 Evaluator #5 Total Points: 3

17

3.4

7. MWBE Participation -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 1
 Evaluator #2 Total Points: 2
 Evaluator #3 Total Points: 3
 Evaluator #4 Total Points: 3
 Evaluator #5 Total Points: 2

11

2.2

8. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise -- 10

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 8
 Evaluator #2 Total Points: 6
 Evaluator #3 Total Points: 6
 Evaluator #4 Total Points: 8
 Evaluator #5 Total Points: 8

36

7.2

9. Use of P-Card -- 10

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 6
 Evaluator #2 Total Points: 2
 Evaluator #3 Total Points: 8
 Evaluator #4 Total Points: 10
 Evaluator #5 Total Points: 8


34

6.8

10. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness -- 40

Evaluator #1 Total Points: _____
 Evaluator #2 Total Points: _____
 Evaluator #3 Total Points: _____
 Evaluator #4 Total Points: _____
 Evaluator #5 Total Points: _____

38.34 - note books



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-8-10

VENDOR: Dell

EVALUATOR #: Dave Lashbrook
#1

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards


2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Very Expensive <input type="radio"/> Expensive <input type="radio"/> Some Expense <input type="radio"/> Minimal Expense <input checked="" type="radio"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> no or non-response <input type="checkbox"/> Expensive <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some expense <input type="checkbox"/> limited expense <input type="checkbox"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: _____

VENDOR: Dell

EVALUATOR #: 2

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)				
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>				
Quality Rating				
Insufficient Response	—	Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
				Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)				
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no or non-response	—	Expensive	some expense	limited expense
				No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)				
Total Cost -				



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-9-10

VENDOR: Dell

EVALUATOR #: 3

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)

Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☒ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)

Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.

Quality Rating

☒ Very Expensive ☐ Expensive ☐ Some Expense ☒ Minimal Expense ☐ No Expense

Evaluate the firm's warranty program.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)

Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)

Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)

Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing

Quality Rating

☐ no or non-response ☐ Expensive ☐ some expense ☒ limited expense ☐ No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)

Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4/7/10

VENDOR: Dell

EVALUATOR #: Samell Wren
#4

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> no or non-response — <input type="checkbox"/> Expensive <input type="checkbox"/> some expense <input type="checkbox"/> limited expense <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 5/24/10

VENDOR: Deji

EVALUATOR #: 5

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense	
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

3. MWBE Participation (5)					
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)				
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>				
Quality Rating				
Insufficient Response	— Marginal Response	Meets Standards	✓ Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)				
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>				
Quality Rating				
no or non-response	— Expensive	some expense	✓ limited expense	No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)	
Total Cost -	40

Build
white
boxes



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910

Purchase and Installation of Computers

EVALUATION DATE: 5.25.10

VENDOR: CompuType

TOTAL COMBINED POINTS: _____

Total points in an evaluation area should be averaged from all evaluators. For example, if there are five evaluators their rating should be averaged, i.e., total points of all five evaluators divided by the number of evaluators

1. Vendor's experience working with the District -- 10

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>2</u>

Total
10

Avg
2

2. Submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>

9

1.8

3. Company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>

6

1.2

4. Vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>

6

1.2

5. Cost of switching vendors -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

Total
8

Avg
1.6

6. Firm's warranty Program -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

7

1.4

7. MWBE Participation -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

8

1.6

8. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise -- 10

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 4
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 4
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 2

14

2.8

9. Use of P-Card -- 10


Evaluator #1 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 4
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 2

12

2.4

10. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness -- 40

Evaluator #1 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #2 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #3 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #4 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #5 Total Points: _____



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-8-10

VENDOR: Computype

EVALUATOR #: Dave Lashbrook

#1

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards


2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive <input type="checkbox"/> Expensive <input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense <input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)				
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)				
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no or non-response	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> some expense	<input type="checkbox"/> limited expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)				
Total Cost -				



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: _____

VENDOR: Compu Type

EVALUATOR #: 2

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense	
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

3. MWBE Participation (5)					
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)				
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>				
Quality Rating				
Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)				
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no or non-response	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> some expense	<input type="checkbox"/> limited expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)				
Total Cost -				



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-9-10

VENDOR: CompuType

EVALUATOR #: IT3

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)

Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)

Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☒ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☒ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☒ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.

Quality Rating

☒ Very Expensive ☒ Expensive ☐ Some Expense ☐ Minimal Expense ☐ No Expense

Evaluate the firm's warranty program.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☒ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)

Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☒ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)

Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.

Quality Rating

☒ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☐ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)

Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing

Quality Rating

no or non-response ☒ Expensive ☐ some expense ☐ limited expense ☐ No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)

Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4/7/10

VENDOR: Compu Type

EVALUATOR #: Jamell Wren

#4

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)				
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>				
Quality Rating				
Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)				
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no or non-response	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> some expense	<input type="checkbox"/> limited expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)				
Total Cost -				



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 5/24/10

VENDOR: CompuType


EVALUATOR #: 5

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insufficient Response	Marginal Response	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards	
2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insufficient Response	Marginal Response	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insufficient Response	Marginal Response	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insufficient Response	Marginal Response	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very Expensive	Expensive	Some Expense	Minimal Expense	No Expense	
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insufficient Response	Marginal Response	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards	
3. MWBE Participation (5)					
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insufficient Response	Marginal Response	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards	

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)				
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="radio"/> Marginal Response	<input type="radio"/> Meets Standards	<input type="radio"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="radio"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)				
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="radio"/> no or non-response	<input type="radio"/> Expensive	<input type="radio"/> some expense	<input type="radio"/> limited expense	<input type="radio"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)	
Total Cost -	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Bid was incomplete - didn't address <u>all</u> needs of RFP



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910

Purchase and Installation of Computers

EVALUATION DATE: 5.25.10
VENDOR: Huber & Associates
TOTAL COMBINED POINTS: _____

Total points in an evaluation area should be averaged from all evaluators. For example, if there are five evaluators their rating should be averaged, i.e., total points of all five evaluators divided by the number of evaluators

1. Vendor's experience working with the District -- 10

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>6</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>2</u>

Total
20

Avg
4

2. Submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>5</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>

15

3

3. Company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>3</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>4</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>

14

2.8

4. Vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program -- 5

Evaluator #1	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #2	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #3	Total Points: <u>2</u>
Evaluator #4	Total Points: <u>1</u>
Evaluator #5	Total Points: <u>1</u>

6

1.2

5. Cost of switching vendors -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 1
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

Total
9

Avg
1.8

6. Firm's warranty Program -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 5
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 4
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

13

2.6

7. MWBE Participation -- 5

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 5
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 4
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 3
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 1

16

3.2

8. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise -- 10

Evaluator #1 Total Points: 10
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 6
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 6
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 8
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 2

32

6.4

9. Use of P-Card -- 10


Evaluator #1 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #2 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #3 Total Points: 6
Evaluator #4 Total Points: 2
Evaluator #5 Total Points: 2

14

2.8

10. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness -- 40

Evaluator #1 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #2 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #3 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #4 Total Points: _____
Evaluator #5 Total Points: _____



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-8-10

VENDOR: Huber

EVALUATOR #: Dave Lashbrook

#1

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive <input type="checkbox"/> Expensive <input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense <input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no or non-response <input type="checkbox"/> Expensive <input type="checkbox"/> some expense <input type="checkbox"/> limited expense <input type="checkbox"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: _____

VENDOR: Huber servers only

EVALUATOR #: 2

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards


2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<input type="radio"/> Insufficient Response <input type="radio"/> Marginal Response <input checked="" type="radio"/> Meets Standards <input type="radio"/> Exceeds Standards <input type="radio"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<input checked="" type="radio"/> no or non-response <input type="radio"/> Expensive <input type="radio"/> some expense <input type="radio"/> limited expense <input type="radio"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4-9-10

VENDOR: Heber

EVALUATOR #: 3

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)

Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.

Quality Rating

☐ Insufficient Response ☐ Marginal Response ☒ Meets Standards ☐ Exceeds Standards ☐ Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)

Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing

Quality Rating

☐ no or non-response ☐ Expensive ☒ some expense ☐ limited expense ☐ No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)

Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 4/17/10

VENDOR: Huber & Associates

EVALUATOR #: Samell Wren

#4

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>				
Quality Rating				
Insufficient Response	— Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards


2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)				
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>				
Quality Rating				
Insufficient Response	— Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards

3. MWBE Participation (5)				
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>				
Quality Rating				
Insufficient Response	— Marginal Response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Far Exceeds Standards

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>
Quality Rating
<div>Insufficient Response</div> <div>— Marginal Response</div> <div>Meets Standards</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards</div> <div>Far Exceeds Standards</div>

5. Use of P-Card (10)
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>
Quality Rating
<div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no or non-response</div> <div>— Expensive</div> <div>some expense</div> <div>limited expense</div> <div>No cost or additional expense involved</div>

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)
Total Cost -



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
RFP # 012-0910
Purchase and Installation of Computers

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

EVALUATION DATE: 5/24/10

VENDOR: Huber + Assoc

EVALUATOR #: 5

1. Vendor's Prior Relationship with District (10)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's experience working with the District.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
2. Meeting Overall Proposal requirements (25)					
<i>Evaluate the Vendor's response to submitting prices for equipment configuration, including video monitors, hard drives and products price list.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the company's plan for delivery and installation of equipment.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the vendor's compliance with submitting an employee purchase program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
<i>Evaluate the cost of switching vendors.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Expensive	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Expense	<input type="checkbox"/> No Expense	
<i>Evaluate the firm's warranty program.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	
3. MWBE Participation (5)					
<i>Evaluate the Firm's response on MWBE Certification.</i>					
Quality Rating					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Marginal Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Far Exceeds Standards	

4. Vendor's Experience and Demonstrated Expertise (10)				
<i>Evaluate the firm's overall experience and qualifications.</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Insufficient Response	<input type="radio"/> Marginal Response	<input type="radio"/> Meets Standards	<input type="radio"/> Exceeds Standards	<input type="radio"/> Far Exceeds Standards

5. Use of P-Card (10)				
<i>Evaluate the use of P-Card included in pricing</i>				
Quality Rating				
<input checked="" type="radio"/> no or non-response	<input type="radio"/> Expensive	<input type="radio"/> some expense	<input type="radio"/> limited expense	<input type="radio"/> No cost or additional expense involved

6. Total Price and Cost Effectiveness (40)	
Total Cost	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Bid was not complete - didn't address <u>all</u> needs from RFP



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: May 27, 2010

To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

From: Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement

VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☒ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #:

Agenda Item: 06-24-P-25
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a sole source renewal contract with Sharon Slane for consulting services and grant writing services to be provided from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$50,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

The consultant will continue to work with the Development Office to design, develop, and submit grant proposals that specifically address District needs and Accountability Plan objectives. Current projects funded through grant proposals written by Dr. Slane are as follows: 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Early Reading First, Teaching American History, Mott Foundation and Homeless Children and Youth. Projects currently being written include: Full Service Community Schools, School Dropout Prevention, Improving the Climate for Learning and Smaller Learning Communities.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance

Row: 126

MSIP: 6.6.1

FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 110-2518-6319-973-00	<u>608</u>	Requisition #:
Amount: \$ 50,000.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$50,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600006555

Department: Development Office

Requestor: Linda Riekens

Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 27, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Blake Youde	
Name of Contract: Dr. Sharon Slane	
Purpose of Contract: Consulting services and grant writing.	
Are there changes versus prior year contract <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$50,000	
Vendor Name: Dr. Sharon Slane	Vendor Number: 600006555
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2010	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2011	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Institutional Advancement	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



REQUEST FOR SOLE SOURCE PURCHASE

Requestor: Linda Riekes	Date: May 17, 2010
Department / School: Development Office	Phone Number: 345-2465
<i>Definition: Sole Source is a good or service that is <u>only</u> available from one (1) source (vendor manufacturer, etc...)</i>	
Unique Goods / Services Requested for Sole Source Purchase (describe in detail below)	
Dr. Slane has written a number of grants that are still active as well as grant proposals that are currently being considered. Her services relative to both the active grants and the grants that she has submitted on behalf of SLPS is required. In addition, her familiarity with the District and its needs cannot be duplicated.	
Vendor Name: Sharon Slane	Email: sharonslane@charter.net
Vendor Contact:	Phone Number: 314-727-7987
Justification Information	
1. Why the uniquely specified goods are required?	
The award of outside funding is essential in order for the district to fully meet the requirements of the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and Accountability Plan.	
2. Why good or services available from other vendors /competitors are not acceptable?	
The vendor has developed, over the last 24 years, a unique understanding of the need of the district and a grasp of the district's internal policies and procedures, enabling extremely efficient turnaround time and outstanding results.	
3. Other relevant information if any (i.e., attach manufacturer's statement verifying exclusive availability of product etc...)	
Attached is a list of funded proposals written by the vendor from 1986 through 2010 - \$65.8 million in awards to the district.	
4. List the Names of other Vendors contacted & Price Quotes:	
<i>I certify the above information is true and correct and that I have no financial, personal or other beneficial interest in the specified vendor.</i>	
Your sole source request will not be approved without the required signatures below:	
Department Head	Date
CFO	Date
Superintendent	Date

Sole Source Checklist

1. Check one of the following:

- ☒ **One-of-a-kind** The commodity or service has no competitive product and is available from only one supplier.

Prior to checking this box you must complete each of the following tasks:

- Search the internet for companies providing similar services.
- Search purchasing files to determine if district has a record of vendors(s) that have provided similar services.
- Document search activities and findings

- ☐ **Compatibility** The commodity or service must match existing brand of equipment for compatibility and is available from only one vendor.

Prior to checking this box you must complete the following task:

- Provide documentation from the provider of the original equipment/services that the equipment/services in question must be provided by the vendor in question

- ☐ **Replacement Part** The commodity is a replacement part for a specific brand of existing equipment and is available from only one supplier.

Prior to checking this box you must complete the following task:

- Document a search for additional suppliers

- ☐ **Delivery Date** Only one supplier can meet necessary delivery requirements.

Prior to checking this box you must complete each of the following tasks:

- Document delivery date and quotes from at least two other vendors
- Document rationale in support of treating the delivery date as mission critical

- ☐ **Research Continuity** The commodity or service must comply with established District standards and is available from only one supplier.

Prior to checking this box you must complete the following task:

- Document district adoption of standard (i.e. Textbook adoption)

- ☐ **Unique Design** The commodity or service must meet physical design or quality requirements and is available from only one supplier.

Prior to checking this box you must complete the following task:

- Sole supplier (i.e. Regional Distributor)

- ☐ **Emergency** URGENT NEED for the item or service does not permit soliciting competitive bids, as in cases of emergencies, disasters, etc.

Prior to checking this box you must complete the following task:

- Complete Emergency Purchase Form

2. If the Sole Source Criteria is met, then complete the Sole Source Form;
3. If the Sole Source Criteria are not met, then the item must be bid.



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: May 17, 2010
Dept / School: Development Office		Reported By: Linda Riekes
Vendor: Dr. Sharon L. Slane		Vendor #: 600006555
Contract # / P.O. #:		Contract Name:
Contract Amount: \$ 50,000		Award Date:
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Proposal planning and development services.		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 X 4 3 2 1	The consultant consistently wins 3-4 grant awards per year for the district, with a 24 year exceeding \$65.8 million.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 X 4 3 2 1	All proposals completed by the consultant were developed in a reasonable time frame and were submitted on or before the deadline.
Business Relations	5 X 4 3 2 1	The consultant was highly professional and responsive in all aspects of her work.
Customer Satisfaction	5 X 4 3 2 1	Feedback on the quality of the consultant's work is excellent.
Cost Control	5 X 4 3 2 1	The consultant fees are extremely cost-effective, representing less than 1.3 percent of the dollars brought into the district in 2009-2010.
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

A LIST OF FUNDED PROPOSALS WRITTEN BY SHARON SLANE 1986-2010
65.8 Million

\$65.8 million (\$65,801,337)

77 grants

Average grant = \$854,563

@\$2,860,928/year over 23 years

@ 3.35 grants/year over 23 years

- Safe Schools Grant, Year 4 Continuation—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$24,964)
- Teaching American History—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$1,305,735 for five years)
- Homeless Children and Youth 2009—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$149,772 for one year)
- Full Service Schools—St. Louis Public Schools (Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, \$100,000 for one year)
- Homeless Children and Youth 2008—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$149,705 for one year)
- Connections for Youth 2007 (Ames & Henry)—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$1,177,956 over five years)
- Connections for Youth 2007 (Bunche & Carr Lane)—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$1,177,956 over five years)
- Connections for Youth 2007 (Cole & Hickey)—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$1,227,848 over five years)
- Mad Science Afterschool Program (three grants: Oak Hill, Sherman, Mark Twain)—St. Louis Public Schools (Governor Blunt's Afterschool METS Program, \$29,805 for one year)
- Afterschool Health and Nutrition Program (three grants: Baden, Clay, Shepard)—St. Louis Public Schools (Governor Blunt's Afterschool Health Program, \$29,982 for one year)
- Parents As Storytellers—St. Louis Public Schools (The Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy, \$64,412 for one year)
- Advanced Placement Incentive Program—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, @ \$2,944,754 over three years)
- Early Reading First—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$4,276,926 over three years)
- Teaching American History—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$619,749 over three years)
- Reading First—St. Louis Public Schools (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, \$10,164,986 over four years)
- P-8 Technology-integrated Magnet School Initiative—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$8,030,160 over three years)
- Connections for Youth 2004—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, @\$2,200,000 over five years)
- Carol M. White Physical Education Program—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$209,345)
- Teaching American History—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$687,637 over three years)
- School Library Literacy Initiative—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$180,829)
- Connections for Youth 2003—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$979,934 over five years)
- Soldan Sound System and Scholarships—St. Louis Public Schools (Paul Newman Foundation, \$20,000)
- Smaller Learning Communities—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$1,458,942 over three years)
- St. Louis LEAD—St. Louis Public Schools (Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds, \$4,840,720 over five years)
- Dropout Prevention Program—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$364,150)
- School Renovation Project—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$200,000)
- Connections for Youth 2000: A 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$5,959,308 over three years)
- Urban Teacher Academy Project—St. Louis Public Schools (Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., \$25,000)
- St. Louis Regional Partnership for Excellence in Teacher Preparation: A Teacher Recruitment Initiative—University of Missouri-St. Louis/St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$1,421,537 over three years)
- Safe Schools/Healthy Students—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$4,558,122 over 3 years)

- Connections for Youth: A 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program—St. Louis Public Schools (USDOE, \$3,059,308 over three years)
- School To Entrepreneurship, Middle School—St. Louis Public Schools (Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, \$78,594)
- Planning Grant for School Reform—St. Louis Public Schools (Walton Family Foundation, \$35,000)
- Toyota Families in Schools—St. Louis Public Schools (National Center for Family Literacy, \$99,263)
- NSF Tutoring Project—St. Louis Public Schools (National Science Foundation, \$141,407)
- Missouri Preschool Project—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$953,705)
- Mini Society Project, Elementary—St. Louis Public Schools (Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, \$88,200)
- Technology Literacy Challenge Fund-Infrastructure Grant—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$192,578 over two years)
- Alternative In-School suspension Model—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$169,855 over three years)
- Community Service Program for Suspended Minority Youth—St. Louis Public Schools (Missouri Department of Public Safety, \$32,592 per year for three years)
- Positive Alternatives to Violence for Female Juvenile Offenders—St. Louis Public Schools/St. Louis Family Court (Missouri Department of Public Safety, \$34,643 per year for three years)
- Cote Brillante School/Community Park and Gardens—St. Louis Public Schools (Whitaker Foundation, \$84,625)
- St. Louis RAMS Health and Physical Fitness Program—St. Louis Public Schools (St. Louis RAMS Foundation, \$10,000)
- The Bridge Project: Connecting Parents and Schools Through Voice Messaging—St. Louis Public Schools (Work/Family Directions, Inc., Citicorp, IBM, BJC Health System, \$120,000)
- Interactive Communications for the Severely Health-impaired Homebound Student—St. Louis Public Schools (MasterCard International, \$41,508)
- Technology-based College Information and Preparation—St. Louis Public Schools (MasterCard International, \$34,596)
- High-speed Internet Access to Elementary Schools—St. Louis Public Schools (Southwestern Bell, \$10,000)
- New Links to New Learning—St. Louis Public Schools (Southwestern Bell Foundation, \$35,000)
- Elementary School Alumni Project—St. Louis Public Schools (J. Ben Miller, \$25,000)
- Initiative to Redesign/Transform Professional Development for Elementary, Middle, and Secondary Principals in the St. Louis Public Schools—St. Louis Public Schools (Danforth Foundation, \$269,629)
- Middle School Initiative: Redesigning/Transforming Middle Level Education in the St. Louis Public Schools—St. Louis Public Schools (Danforth Foundation, \$699,000)
- The St. Louis Parent Partnership Academy—St. Louis Public Schools (Danforth Foundation, \$599,023)
- Project Turnaround—St. Louis Public Schools (United Way, \$34,924)
- A Good Beginning for Every Child—St. Louis Public Schools (Danforth Foundation, \$34,749)
- Project "Safety Nets"—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$914,802)
- St. Louis Consortium for Dropout Prevention—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$865,851)
- Portfolio Assessment Project for Enrichment Labs—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$15,000)
- Parents As Teachers of the Humanities (PATH)—St. Louis Public Schools (Missouri Humanities Council, \$6,315)
- Leadership for Action (a drug education/training for educators)—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$ 95,054)
- Parents As Teachers of the Humanities (PATH)—St. Louis Public Library/St. Louis Public Schools (NEH, \$ 25,000)
- Project Even Start (a family-centered education program)—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, @ \$1,000,000)
- Crack, Alcohol, AIDS, and Infants, a training program for educators—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$ 81,442)

- The Bill of Rights Then and Now—Webster University/St. Louis Public Schools (Bicentennial Commission, \$ 58,988)
- Law-Related Education for Special Learners—Bar Association of Metropolitan St. Louis/St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$ 100,000)
- SCOPE, an after-school program for K-12 students—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$ 100,000)
- Missouri Literacy Project for Homeless Adults—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$280,617)
- Prevention and Support Services (PASS), a prevention training program for school counselors, social workers, and nurses—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$112,277)
- The Bill of Rights: An Interdisciplinary Study—St. Louis Public Schools (Bicentennial Commission, \$66,650)
- Teachers As Prevention Resources (TAP) Project—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$150,000)
- Citizenship In Action (a drug and alcohol abuse prevention training program for parents, teachers, and students)—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$175,000)
- Project CARE (drug and alcohol abuse prevention, K-6)—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$114,478)
- Enhancing Self-Esteem Through Art and Storytelling—St. Louis Public Schools (DESE, \$15,000)
- Writers of the Harlem Renaissance (a humanities project for the middle grades)—St. Louis Public Schools (NEH, \$13,338)
- American Essayists and Social Justice (a humanities project for the middle grades)—St. Louis Public Schools (NEH, \$12,632)
- Equity Around the World (a curriculum development project for grade 6)—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$39,644)
- Missouri Then and Now: Models of Civic Responsibility for Young Students (a law-related education curriculum for grade 4)—St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$50,816)
- Project PLACE, law-related education for grade 3---St. Louis Public Schools (DOE, \$45,000)

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 20, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 10-20-09-01

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-26
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:


To approve a renewal contract with Compass Management Consulting, LLC for consulting services to be provided from July 15, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$24,000.00. This contract is renewable annually for the life of the grant.

BACKGROUND:

Compass Management Consulting, LLC was selected through an RFP to provide external evaluation services for "Let Freedom Ring: Participating in American History Through Primary Documents", a Teaching American History grant awarded to the St. Louis Public Schools by the U.S. Department of Education. The overarching goal of "Let Freedom Ring" is to reform and revitalize the District's American history program at the elementary school level through an intensive professional development program for all of the District's fourth and fifth grade teachers. The project will serve 30 fourth and fifth grade teachers each year.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance **Row:** 126**MSIP:** 6.6.1**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 290-2518-6319-973-UQ	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$ 24,000.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$24,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600013865

Department: Development Office**Requestor:** Linda Riekes

 Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement


 Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


 Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


 Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 27, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Blake Youde	
Name of Contract: Compass Management, LLC	
Purpose of Contract: External evaluation services for the Elementary Teaching American History Grant.	
Are there changes versus prior year contract <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$24,0000	
Vendor Name: Compass Management Consulting, LLC	Vendor Number: 600013865
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2010	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2011	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Institutional Advancement	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: June 30, 2010
Dept / School: Development Office		Reported By: Linda Riekes
Vendor: Compass Management Consulting, LLC		Vendor #: 600013965
Contract # / P.O/ #: 4500149990		Contract Name:
Contract Amount: \$ 24,000		Award Date:
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): External evaluation services for the Elementary Teaching American History Grant project, "Let Freedom Ring: Participating in American History Through Primary Documents.		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 X	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 X	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Business Relations	5 X	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Customer Satisfaction	5 X	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Cost Control	5 X	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: September 24, 2009
To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent
From: Blake Youde, Deputy Superintendent of Institutional Advancement

Agenda Item 10-20-09-01
Information ☐
Conference ☐
Action ☒

Subject:

Contract with Compass Management Consulting, LLC for consulting services to be provided from October 21, 2009 through June 30, 2010, renewable annually (July 1-June 30) for the life of the grant, subject to acceptable performance, at a cost not to exceed \$24,000 per year.

Background:


Compass Management Consulting will provide external evaluation services for "Let Freedom Ring: Participating in American History Through Primary Documents," a Teaching American History grant awarded to St. Louis Public Schools by the U.S. Department of Education. The overarching goal of "Let Freedom Ring" is to reform and revitalize the district's American history program at the elementary school level through an intensive professional development program for all of the district's fourth and fifth grade teachers. The project will serve 30 fourth and fifth grade teachers each year. The project is aligned with state and district standards. (MSIP: 6.7; CSIP: 6.7.2)


The external evaluation contract for "Let Freedom Ring" was issued as RFP #007-0910 on September 10, 2009. A bidder's conference was held on September 17, 2009, and bids were opened and evaluated on September 24, 2009. Compass Management Consulting, LLC was the successful bidder.


Funding Source: 290-2518-973-UQ-6319-290 **Requisition No.:** 10114941


Cost not to exceed: \$24,000


Recommendation: Approval


Blake Youde, Deputy Superintendent
Institutional Advancement


Angela Banks, Interim Budget,
Director


Enos Moss
CFO/Treasurer


Kelvin R. Adams, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Schools


9/29/09

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 20, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☐ Contract Renewal
☒ Memorandum of Understanding

Previous Bd. Res. #:

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-27
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Coat-A-Kid, Inc. to allow Coat-A-Kid, Inc. to provide new coats, hats and gloves to kids in need, and to fit these coats on students with help from the staff at the elementary and special needs schools where needs are identified by the District. The services included in this MOU will be provided from August 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011.

BACKGROUND:

The Coat-A-Kid Program has worked in a number of District schools over the past several years. The MOU will formalize the relationship between the District and Coat-A-Kid, Inc. to ensure that students in need will receive new coats, hats and gloves.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 44**MSIP:** 7.6.1**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$ 0.00	<input type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #:

Department: Development Office**Requestor:** Linda Riekes


 Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement



Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director



Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer



Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
(WITH NON-FUNDRAISING)

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by and between the Saint Louis Public Schools ("SLPS") and the Coat-A-Kid, Inc. ("Agency") on this 1st day of August 2010.

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding is to establish a partnership between Coat-A-Kid, Inc. and the St. Louis Public Schools in order to allow Coat-A-Kid, Inc. to provide coats to kids in need, and to fit these coats on students with help from the staff at specified elementary and special education schools. The Memorandum of Understanding begins August 2010 for the 2010-2011 school year.

1. Fundraising: It is understood by The Agency that the SLPS does not endorse any fundraising efforts by the Agency, whether or not associated with the activities and duties contemplated by this MOU. To the extent that the Agency believes in the future that its activities require fundraising, the parties agree that all documents and activities associated with any such fundraising effort will be cooperatively prepared and separately agreed to, and **must be approved by the Special Administrative Board of the Transitional School District of the City of St. Louis prior to implementation.**

2. Limitation of Liability: Each party to this MOU shall be solely responsible for any and all actions, suits, damages, liability, or other proceedings brought against it as a result of the alleged negligence, misconduct, error, or omission of any of its officers, agents or employees. Neither party is obligated to indemnify the other party or to hold the other party harmless from costs or expenses incurred as a result of such claims, and the SLPS shall continue to enjoy all rights, claims, and defenses available to it under law, to specifically include Mo.Rev.Stat. §537.600, et seq. Nothing in the MOU shall be construed as an indemnification by one party or the other for liabilities of a party or third persons for property or any other loss, damage, death, or personal injury arising out of the performance of this MOU. Any liabilities or claims for property or other loss, damage, death, or personal injury by a party or its agents, employees, contractors, or assigns or by third persons arising out of and during this MOU shall be determined according to applicable law. SLPS does not relinquish or waive any of its rights under applicable state governmental immunities law.

3. Background Checks: All Personnel providing services under this MOU that may in any way come into contact with students must undergo background checks consistent with those used by the SLPS and state-licensed facilities; all such checks must be performed and passed prior to any Personnel providing any services hereunder. At a minimum, checks hereunder shall include a Department of Family Services background check, a criminal background check, and fingerprinting. The cost of all such background checks shall be borne by the Agency, and the SLPS shall not be liable for such cost under any circumstance. The Agency will provide written confirmation to SLPS that the background checks on all Personnel hereunder reflected no negative findings, that said Personnel passed the background checks and are, therefore, eligible to provide services under this MOU.

4. **Student Information:** The Agency acknowledges that it shall now, and in the future may, have access to and contact with confidential information of students, including but not limited to the education and/or medical records of students. Both during the term of this MOU and thereafter, the Agency covenants and agrees to hold such information in trust and confidence and to exercise diligence in protecting and safeguarding such information, as well as any other information protected from public disclosure by federal or state law or by the policies or procedures of the SLPS. The Agency will not disclose any confidential information to any third party except as may be required in the course of performing services for the SLPS hereunder or by law, and any disclosure will be in compliance with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA") and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA").

5. **Obligations of SLPS:**

(a) SLPS will identify the number of schools to receive new coats, hats, gloves from Coat-A-Kid, Inc. St. Louis Public Schools will provide a district liaison person to work directly with Coat-A-Kid, Inc. to quickly and effectively resolve any needs or issues that might arise in the process of providing new coats, hats, and gloves to SLPS students identified in need.

(b) St. Louis Public Schools will provide meetings and correspondence with social workers and other school personnel as requested by Coat-A-Kid, Inc.

(c) St. Louis Public Schools will provide a May Meeting with participating social workers to discuss the benefits for the students and to look carefully at ways of improving the process for students and volunteers.

6. **Obligations of Agency:**

(a) Coat-A-Kid, Inc will provide new coats, hats and gloves free of charge to students identified by SLPS as in need in the specified SLPS elementary schools, and special needs schools.

(b) Coat-A-Kid, Inc will work closely with the district liaison and explain any needs and issues promptly that might arise in the process of providing new coats, hats, and gloves to SLPS students identified as in need so that they can be resolved quickly and effectively.

(c) Coat-A-Kid, Inc. will maintain an accurate record of items provided and number of children served.

7. **Success of this program will be measured using the following Performance Standards:**

Performance Standards: Agency performance at the end of the term of this Memorandum of Understanding will be measured by the Agency's compliance with the following performance standards:

(a) Coat-A-Kid, Inc. will provide new coats, gloves, and hats. The number of recipients will be mutually agreed upon by SLPS and Coat-A-Kid, Inc.

(b) Coat-A-Kid, Inc will serve students who were provided a new coat but have been identified as needing to have a replacement coat. The number of recipients will be mutually agreed upon by SLPS and Coat-A-Kid, Inc.

8. Term and Renewal: The term of the MOU will be one year from the Effective Date, unless earlier terminated by either party by providing thirty (30) days' written notice to the person who has signed as a representative of each party below.

Saint Louis Public Schools

Coat-A-Kid, Inc.

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 20, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☐ Contract Renewal
☒ Memorandum of Understanding

Previous Bd. Res. #:

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-28
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with The Little Bit Foundation to provide basic essentials such as uniforms, clothing, shoes, underwear, school supplies and hygiene items to those children in need at 11 of the District elementary schools. The MOU will be for the period August 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011.

BACKGROUND:

The Little Bit Foundation has worked in a number of District schools over the past several years. The MOU will formalize the relationship between the District and The Little Bit Foundation to ensure that students in need will receive the basic essentials mentioned above.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 44**MSIP:** 7.6.1**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)


Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$ 0.00	<input type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #:

Department: Development Office**Requestor:** Linda Riekes

 Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement


 Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


 Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


 Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
(NON-FUNDRAISING)

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by and between the Saint Louis Public Schools ("SLPS") and The Little Bit Foundation on the 1st day of August 2010.

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding is to establish a partnership between The Little Bit Foundation and the St. Louis Public Schools. The Little Bit Foundation will provide basic essentials such as uniforms, clothing, shoes, underwear, school supplies and hygiene items to those children in need. The Memorandum of Understanding begins August 2010 for the 2010-2011 school year.

1. Fundraising: It is understood by The Agency that the SLPS does not endorse any fundraising efforts by the Agency, whether or not associated with the activities and duties contemplated by this MOU. To the extent that the Agency believes in the future that its activities require fundraising, the parties agree that all documents and activities associated with any such fundraising effort will be cooperatively prepared and separately agreed to, and **must be approved by the Special Administrative Board of the Transitional School District of the City of St. Louis prior to implementation.**

2. Limitation of Liability: Each party to this MOU shall be solely responsible for any and all actions, suits, damages, liability, or other proceedings brought against it as a result of the alleged negligence, misconduct, error, or omission of any of its officers, agents or employees. Neither party is obligated to indemnify the other party or to hold the other party harmless from costs or expenses incurred as a result of such claims, and the SLPS shall continue to enjoy all rights, claims, and defenses available to it under law, to specifically include Mo.Rev.Stat. §537.600, et seq. Nothing in the MOU shall be construed as an indemnification by one party or the other for liabilities of a party or third persons for property or any other loss, damage, death, or personal injury arising out of the performance of this MOU. Any liabilities or claims for property or other loss, damage, death, or personal injury by a party or its agents, employees, contractors, or assigns or by third persons arising out of and during this MOU shall be determined according to applicable law. SLPS does not relinquish or waive any of its rights under applicable state governmental immunities law.

3. Background Checks: All Personnel providing services under this MOU that may in any way come into contact with students must undergo background checks consistent with those used by the SLPS and state-licensed facilities; all such checks must be performed and passed prior to any Personnel providing any services hereunder. At a minimum, checks hereunder shall include a Department of Family Services background check, a criminal background check, and fingerprinting. The cost of all such background checks shall be borne by the Agency, and the SLPS shall not be liable for such cost under any circumstance. The Agency will provide written confirmation to SLPS that the background checks on all Personnel hereunder reflected no negative findings that said Personnel passed the background checks and are, therefore, eligible to provide services under this MOU.

4. Student Information: The Agency acknowledges that it shall now, and in the future may, have access to and contact with confidential information of students, including but not limited to the education and/or medical records of students. Both during the term of this MOU and thereafter, the Agency covenants and agrees to hold such information in trust and confidence and to exercise diligence in protecting and safeguarding such information, as well as any other information protected from public disclosure by federal or state law or by the policies or procedures of the SLPS. The Agency will not disclose any confidential information to any third party except as may be required in the course of performing services for the SLPS hereunder or by law, and any disclosure will be in compliance with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”).

5. Obligations of SLPS:

(a) In each Little Bit Foundation School, a school liaison will be assigned to identify children in need and work with The Little Bit Foundation school representatives to make sure those needs are met.

(b) School staff will be committed to identifying children in need and to determining “need” vs. “want.” They will work with the liaison to complete and submit order forms.

(c) The school liaison and social workers will assist The Little Bit Foundation in following up with children served to ensure that their needs continue to be met.

6. Obligations of Agency:

(a) Provide clothing, shoes, coats, backpacks, books and hygiene items to those children identified as “in need” at The Little Bit Foundation sponsored schools.

(b) The Little Bit Foundation volunteers will visit the schools each week and personally see that each child is fit properly.

(c) The Little Bit Foundation staff and volunteers will work with the school staff and liaison to help them identify children that are in need.

7. Success of this program will be measured using the following Performance Standards:

Performance Standards: Agency performance at the end of the term of this Memorandum of Understanding will be measured by the Agency’s compliance with the following performance standards:

(a) The Little Bit Foundation will serve 100% of the children in need that have submitted requests through the school liaison.

(b) The Little Bit Foundation will provide services with the utmost care and compassion and treat every child with dignity and respect.

8. Term and Termination: The term of the MOU will be one year from the Effective Date, unless earlier terminated by either party by providing thirty (30) days' written notice to the person who has signed as a representative of each party below.

Saint Louis Public Schools

(Agency) The Little Bit Foundation

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: May 27, 2010

To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

From: Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement

VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☐ Contract Renewal
☒ Memorandum of Understanding

Previous Bd. Res. #:

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-29
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with The Curators of the University of Missouri on behalf of the University of Missouri to implement and evaluate the Missouri College Advising Corps program at Soldan International Studies High School. The program will be in place for the period July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011. This is the second year of the program at Soldan.

BACKGROUND:

The Missouri College Advising Corps Program will be placed in Soldan to advise students on how to prepare for college admission, choose a college that matches their interests and complete admission and financial aid applications.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance

Row: 44

MSIP: 7.6.1

FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$ 0.00	<input type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #:

Department: Academic Service

Requestor: Dr. Thomas Cason

Blake Youde, Dep. Supt., Institutional Advancement

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (MOA)

**for the
Missouri College Advising Corps
(MU Project # C00014462)**

**by and between
The Curators of the University of Missouri
on behalf of the University of Missouri**

**and the
St. Louis Public School District for Soldan International Studies High School**

1. Purpose

This Memorandum of Agreement (hereafter MOA) describes the nature of the collaborative effort and specifies the roles and responsibilities of the University of Missouri (hereafter MU) and school/district in implementing and evaluating the Missouri College Advising Corps (hereafter MCAC) program. MU and the school/district OR college understand that this collaborative effort is not a joint venture or partnership agreement between the two parties. This MOA does not authorize either party to represent the other party in any discussions with third parties or entities.

2. Program Design

One MCAC College Guide (hereafter Guide) will be placed in the school to advise students on how to prepare for college admission, choose a college that matches their interests, and complete admission and financial aid applications.

3. Responsibilities

MU:

- Employ and compensate the Guide.
- Provide pre- and in-service training to the Guide.
- Monitor services provided by the Guide through oversight of personnel issues (e.g. appearance, professionalism, hours worked, work schedule, and leave time).
- Make on-site visits to observe and monitor the Guides' work.
- Provide evaluative feedback to the Guide about his/her work performance.
- Discuss the Guide's performance with the site supervisor.
- Maintain ongoing communication with the site supervisor and other contact persons designated by the school/district.
- Oversee program evaluation as described in Section 4 of this MOA.
- Facilitate and conduct a first-of-year, mid- and end-of-year meeting with the site supervisor (an assessment of the program will be conducted at the mid- and end-of-year meetings).

School/District:

- Understand the role and responsibilities of the College Guide.
- Provide a collaborative atmosphere to facilitate student access to college.

- Provide a private or semi-private office space, a computer with internet access, a phone, and read only access to student data for the Guide to use while on site. The Guide agrees to use these resources for the provision of services to students.
- Provide data for the purpose of evaluating the program's success and as described in Section 4 of this MOA.
- Provide ongoing on-site supervision through designation of a site supervisor who will:
 - attend a site supervisor orientation session;
 - provide direction and support to the Guide while servicing students in the school;
 - work with the Guide to set goals for the year that are congruent with the schools' goals;
 - introduce the Guide at a faculty meeting, general assembly, or other venues so students, teachers, counselors, and administrators understand the Guide's role;
 - assist in identifying low-income, first-generation, underrepresented students to progress toward college admission;
 - hold ongoing meetings with the College Guide to provide updates on progress, solve issues that arise and explore opportunities for further collaboration;
 - have direct and regular contact with the MCAC program staff involved in the administration of this program; and
 - participate in first-of-year and mid- and end-of-year meetings with MCAC program staff (an assessment of the program will be conducted at the mid- and end-of-year meetings).

Guide:

- Provide these services, free of charge:
 - Advise students on a one-to-one basis regarding their post-secondary plans;
 - Hold open office hours as well as scheduled appointments;
 - Review students' college application materials and assist with understanding the FAFSA and other financial aid forms;
 - Work closely with guidance staff and other administrators to promote students' college-going behavior;
 - Coordinate publicity and outreach, ensuring that students and their families are aware of opportunities involving college admission and financial aid;
 - Provide information through presentations, Web sites, brochures, and other forms of communication;
 - Plan and coordinate visits to colleges and universities in Missouri for students to experience campus life and identify a "best fit";
 - Help students find scholarship resources;
 - Host college fairs and information sessions for students; and
 - Participate in extracurricular activities in the high school and its surrounding community for the purpose of building relationships with students and their families.

Upon agreement of MU and the school/district, additional services may be provided so that unique needs of the schools' students are met, as the program matures, and/or additional funding is obtained. Additional responsibilities agreed upon by both parties should be submitted as an attachment to the signed Annual Agreement.

4. Program Evaluation

Funding for the MCAC program is provided by MU and by external funders. As a condition of external funding, the program will be evaluated on an ongoing basis.

Data will be collected and managed through a technology firm contracted by the National College Advising Corps (NCAC), MCAC's umbrella organization. It is required that the school/district provide needed data. Data will be used for program evaluation purposes only and treated as confidential, except as may be required by law. All results of data analysis will be reported in aggregate and no individual student will ever be identified.

Data to be collected will include, but not necessarily be limited to: baseline information on the school, including college matriculation rates and student attainment of intermediary college enrollment goals (such as percent taking college entrance exams and FAFSA applications); information on enrolled students during program implementation, including identifying information, intermediary goals, and college enrollment; and information on services provided to students. At the school level, the Guide will collect data to help target and track services and evaluate the program's success.

5. Rights Reserved

MU reserves the right to move a Guide from one school to another.

The school/district reserves the right to request that a Guide be moved out of the school.

6. Cancellation of MOA

This MOA may be cancelled by either party, provided advance written notice of at least 30 days is given to the other party.

ANNUAL AGREEMENT
Memorandum of Agreement for MU Project # C00014462

Name of School/District/College (Fill in the name of the partner school and district)

High School Name Soldan International Studies High School

School District Name ST. Louis Public Schools

Duration of Agreement:

This agreement applies exclusively to the 2010-2011 school year.

The College Guide begins service in the school/district on or around August 1, 2010 and concludes on the last day of school.

If funding is obtained, MU will discuss with the school/district continuation of the MCAC program for additional years.

Name of Site Supervisor designated by the school/district

NAME: Alice L. Manns, Ph.D.

TITLE: Assistant Principal

MAILING ADDRESS: 918 Union Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63108

PHONE: (314) 367-9222 ext. 109

E-MAIL: Alice.Manns@slps.org

Central Point of Contact

The parties listed below will serve as the central point of contact for this MOA. Either party may change points of contact by giving written notice.

If different that the Site Supervisor listed above,

NAME: _____

TITLE: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

PHONE: _____

E-MAIL: _____

MU names Dr. Ann Korschgen, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, 573-882-7651, korschgena@missouri.edu as the central point of contact for issues related to this agreement.

Signatures of Agreement

MU and the school/district agree to proceed with their obligations to implement and evaluate the MCAC program.

For the school/district:

NAME _____

TITLE

DATE

For Missouri College Advising Corps:

Dr. Ann Korschgen	DATE
Vice Provost for Enrollment Management	
University of Missouri-Columbia	

For the Curators of the University of Missouri:

Dr. Jennifer Duncan	DATE
Interim Director	
Office of Sponsored Program Administration	
MU Project # C00014462	

**PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
FOR THE 2010-2011 MISSOURI COLLEGE ADVISING CORPS PROGRAM YEAR**

At the High School Level:

- Increase percent of seniors who apply for are accepted by postsecondary institutions in Missouri;
- Increase the number of parents/guardians of students who have the information needed to encourage their children to attend college, including information on obtaining financial aid;
- Increase the percent of graduates who take the ACT;
- Increase the percent of graduates who complete the FAFSA;
- Increase the percent of students who apply for state grants by the deadline;
- Increase the percent of students who complete at least one college application;
- Increase the percent of students who apply for scholarships and the dollar amount of scholarships awarded to seniors;
- Gather resources about the college planning process and make them available to all students;
- Attempt to meet with each senior at least 1 time;
- Provide recurring one-on-one service to a minimum of 75% of seniors;
- Hold a minimum of 5 meetings with freshmen, sophomores, and/or juniors and their families;
- Hold a minimum of 2 meetings with students and their families on the topic of financial literacy and/or financial aid - one of the two meetings needs to include freshmen, sophomores, and/or juniors and their families;
- Plan and facilitate bus trips to a minimum of 3 campuses - a minimum of 1 of the 3 trips should include freshmen, sophomores, and/or juniors; and
- Hold a minimum of 2 meetings that includes outreach to 7th and 8th graders in the school district.

At the Community College Level:

- Increase the percent of students who have the information needed to prepare to transfer to a four-year college or university;
- Increase percent of students who apply for and matriculate to a four-year institutions in Missouri;
- Hold a minimum of 2 meetings with students and their families on the topics related to the transfer process (e.g., financial literacy, financial aid, college application process);
- Plan and facilitate bus trips to include students to a minimum of 3 campuses;
- Gather resources about the college transfer process and make them available to all students; and
- Meet with a minimum of 100 students.



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: June 3, 2010

To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

From: Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt. - Academics

VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:

☒ RFP/Bid RFP 031-0910
☐ Sole Source
☐ Insurance Policy Renewal
☐ Ratification

Agenda Item:
Information:
Conference:
Action:

06-24-10-30
☐
☐
☐
☒

SUBJECT:

To approve the contract with Abbott Ambulance, Inc. to provide the ambulance services for all high school varsity and junior varsity football games next fall. The period of the contract will be August 15, 2010 through December 1, 2010 at a cost not to exceed \$15,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

The selection of Abbott Ambulance, Inc. was through the RFP process. The cost of the services for the 2010 season to provide service to both varsity and junior varsity games (a total of 73 games) will be virtually the same as the cost for only the varsity games in 2009 (a total of 47 games).

CSIP: Goal # SLPS Goal #2 - Process and Performance Row # 120 MSIP: 6.4.4

FUNDING SOURCE: (Fund Type) - (Function) - (Object Code) - (Location Code) - (Project Code)

Fund Source: 110 - 1421 - 6319 - 833 - 00 GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$ 15,000.00	
Fund Source: - - - - -	Requisition #:
Amount:	
Fund Source: - - - - -	Requisition #:
Amount:	
Cost not to Exceed: \$ 15,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability
Vendor #:	To Be Assigned

Department: Public High League Office

Requestor:

Sam Dunlap

Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt. - Academics

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

5.3 PART II – COST/PRICING PROPOSAL

5.3.1 Attachment B – Cost/Pricing Proposal

ATTACHMENT B
COST / PRICING PROPOSAL

1. The following describes our cost/pricing proposal to provide services specified in Attachment A – Scope of Services of the Ambulance Services for Football Games, dated May 6th, 2010.

Cost of Proposal – Varsity Games

Cost Per Game \$ 300.00

Total Cost for 47 Games \$ 14,100.00

Optional Cost of Proposal – Junior Varsity Games

Cost Per Game \$ 187.50

2. Brief Explanation of the Services to be provided under the above cost/pricing proposal.

Services include ALS Ambulance staffed with an EMT and a Paramedic to be in
place at directed time and will be released following the game by direction.
First Aid and advance services will be provided. Non- emergency transports will
be made by additional vehicle that will be called in by on site crew in order to keep
event medically covered. In a true emergency transport situation, the on site crew
will transport and advise dispatch for backfill with another ALS vehicle.

Signature of Authorized Official MARK L Corley May 19, 2010 Date

Abbott Ambulance, Inc.
Company Name

5.3.2 Specific Cost/Pricing Proposal

The cost per Varsity football game for each forty-five (45) scheduled regular season game, as well as the two (2) scheduled post-season games will be \$300.00 per game. The total cost for all forty-seven (47) scheduled Varsity football games will be \$14,100.

The cost per game for Junior Varsity football is \$187.50.

5.3.3 Details of the Cost/Pricing Proposal

Services include ALS Ambulance staffed with an EMT and a Paramedic to be in place at directed time and will be released following the game by direction. First Aid and advance services will be provided. Non-emergency transports will be made by additional vehicle that will be called in by on site crew in order to keep event medically covered. In a true emergency transport situation, the on site crew will transport and advise dispatch for backfill with another ALS vehicle.



**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** June 2, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Amendment
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 10-08-09-04

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-31
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract amendment to increase the contract amount with Midwest Music Therapy Services, Inc. to provide music therapy services to students with disabilities by \$12,400 for the current school year. The original contract amount of \$19,600 will be increased by \$12,400 for a total contract amount of \$32,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

Midwest Music Therapy Services, Inc. provides, on an "as needed" basis, music therapy services to students with disabilities as identified by their Individual Education Program (IEP). Services to include evaluation and assessments, specialized instruction and therapy and IEP implementation. All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 134**MSIP:** 7.1.2**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 270-2132-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$12,400.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$12,400.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600013853

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones

 Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics


 Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


 Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


 Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: May 17, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Chip Jones
Vendor: Midwest Music Therapy Services, Inc.		Vendor #: 600013853
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149450		Contract Name: Music Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 19,600.00		Award Date: 10/8/09
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): To provide music therapy services for those students who are identified with a need in their IEP.		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Business Relations	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Customer Satisfaction	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Cost Control	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Average Score	5.0	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

VENDOR PERFORMANCE REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

Type of report	Identify if this the final report or a quarterly report (3 months)
Report Date	the date the report is prepared
Department	Indicate the name of the reporting department
Reported By	Please sign your name
Vendor	Enter the vendor's name
Vendor Number	Enter the vendor's assigned number
Contract # / PO #	Enter the assigned contract # or the purchase order # for the goods or Services being reported
Contract Name	This the official name used when the contract was solicited
Contract Amount	The total dollar value of the contract: the amount listed on the Board Resolution
Award Date	Enter the date that the Board approved this contract
Contract Description	Provide a brief description of the work being done under the contract
Performance Ratings	In the comment column provide the rationale for the rating you give. Indicate the contract requirements that were exceeded, were not exceeded, or were not met by the vendor

Performance Ratings Guidelines

Rating	Category	Description
5	Exceptional	Met all performance requirements; Minor problems; Effective corrective actions; Improved performance; Quality results
4	Very Good	Met all performance requirements; Minor problems; Effective corrective actions
3	Satisfactory	Met all performance requirements; Minor problems; Satisfactory corrective actions
2	Marginal	Some performance requirements not met; Performance reflects some serious problem; Ineffective corrective actions
1	Unsatisfactory	Most performance requirements are not met; Recovery not likely

Performance Categories Descriptions

Category	Description
Quality of Goods and / or Services	Rate the vendor's technical performance or the quality of the product or services delivered under the contract
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	Rate the vendor's performance based on the delivery requirements of the contract. If the vendor significantly exceeded the requirements (to SLPS benefit); quickly resolved delivery issues
Business Relations	Rate the vendor's professionalism; responsiveness; significantly exceeded expectations; customer service; limited change orders
Customer Satisfaction	Rate the vendor based on feedback you receive from your customers (end-users)
Cost Control	Make your ratings based on the vendor's effectiveness in forecasting, managing and controlling contract cost. This assesses whether the vendor met original cost estimated or needed to negotiate cost changes to meet contract requirements

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 25, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Amendment
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 10-08-09-04

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-32
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract amendment to increase the contract amount with Mid-America Therapy to provide occupational therapy services to students with disabilities by \$81,200 for the current school year. The original contract amount of \$372,650 will be increased by \$81,200 for a total contract amount of \$453,850.00.


BACKGROUND:

Mid-America Therapy provides, on an "as needed" basis, occupational therapy services to students with disabilities as identified by their Individual Education Program (IEP). Services to include evaluation and assessments, specialized instruction and therapy and IEP implementation. All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.


CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 134**MSIP:** 7.1.2**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)


Fund Source: 270-1511-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$81,200.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$81,200.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600013853

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones


 Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics


 Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


 Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


 Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

Schaeffer, Rick M.

From: Jones, Chip
Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 2010 3:44 PM
To: Schaeffer, Rick M.
Cc: Jones, Chip
Subject: FW: Rationale for Increase in OT Contract

Rick, here's the rationale again.

From: Davenport, Sheryl H.
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 9:40 AM
To: Schaeffer, Rick M.; Jones, Chip
Subject: Rationale for Increase in OT Contract

Dr. Jones and Rick,

The rationale for the OT contract is during the course of the 2009 – 2010 school year, one of the full-time occupational therapists left the school district. Additionally, there was an increase in the number of students who were eligible for the service.

*Sheryl Davenport, Ed. D.
ECSE, Process Supervisor
St. Louis Public Schools
801 N. 11th.
St. Louis, MO, 63101
314-633-5380
314-633-5458*

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 27, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☒ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #:

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-33
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a sole source contract with Touchpoint Autism Services for placement services for students with autism to be provided for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$200,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

Touchpoint Autism Services provides a programmatic option for our most complex students with autism that demonstrate safety concerns to themselves and others after exhausting all interventions in less restrictive programs across the continuum of service. Presently, there is one student that requires this level of intervention, and it is predicted that 1-2 students a year will need intervention requiring specialized skill/expertise/experience at this level of intervention. The goal is to improve student outcomes (behavior in an educational setting) to the point where services can be provided in a less restrictive setting. Thus, short-term (3-12 months) placement with a focus on assessment, diagnostic instruction, stabilization and then, transition planning toward less restrictive placements is needed.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 137**MSIP:** 7.1.1**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 650-1249-6311-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$200,000.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$200,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600013928

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones

Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Private Placement Services for students with Autism	
Purpose of Contract: Private Placement Services for students with Autism	
Are there changes versus prior year contract Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$105,600	
Vendor Name: Touchpoint Autism Services	Vendor Number: 600013928
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: May 17, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Chip Jones
Vendor: Touchpoint Autism Services		Vendor #: 600013928
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500152078		Contract Name: Placement Services for Autism Services
Contract Amount: \$ 105,600.00		Award Date: 12/3/09
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): To provide a programmatic option for our most complex students with autism.		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 4 + 3 2 1	
Business Relations	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Customer Satisfaction	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Cost Control	5 4 + 3 2 1	
Average Score	4.6	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes X No <input type="checkbox"/>		

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 27, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 08-06-09-13

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-34
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal for contracts for speech therapy services to be provided for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 with multiple vendors (listed below) at a total combined cost not to exceed \$1,418,870.00.

BACKGROUND:

This is the second renewal of the contracts approved under RFP 051-0708. The agencies listed below will provide, on an "as needed" basis, speech therapy services to students with disabilities as identified by their Individual Education Program (IEP). Services are to include screenings for evaluations, participation in diagnostic staffing, IEP development and implementation. All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.

Educational Based Services, City Speech, Career Staff Unlimited, Cumberland Therapy, Mid-America Therapy, and Childgarden Child Development Center.


CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 134**MSIP:**

7.1.2


FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)


Fund Source: 140-2132-6319-828-MZ	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$1,418,870.00		
Fund Source: 270-1511-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source: 220-1225-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$1,418,870.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: Various

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones


 Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics


 Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


 Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


 Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Speech Therapy Services	
Purpose of Contract: Speech Therapy Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No	
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$77.25 to \$79.56.	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$480,000	
Vendor Name: EBS Healthcare	Vendor Number: 600009187
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Yvonne R. Tate
Vendor: EBS Healthcare		Vendor #: 600009187
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149174		Contract Name: Speech Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 360,000		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Speech Therapy Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 ✓4 3 2 1	This vendor's therapists meet the expectations of the contractual arrangement.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 ✓4 3 2 1	This vendor calls often to ascertain needs or to offer service upgrades where possible.
Business Relations	✓5 4 3 2 1	I get immediate assistance from the home office whenever needed.
Customer Satisfaction	5 ✓4 3 2 1	Minor issues are addressed in a timely manner.
Cost Control	✓5 4 3 2 1	I get periodic updates from Anna Munson alerting me of the contract status.
Average Score	4.4	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Speech Therapy Services	
Purpose of Contract: Speech Therapy Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract Yes X No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$126,633	
Vendor Name: City Speech, Inc.	Vendor Number: 600004605
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Speech Therapy		Reported By: Yvonne R. Tate
Vendor: City Speech, Inc.		Vendor #: 600004605
Contract # / P.O/ #: 4500149176		Contract Name: Speech Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 126,633		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Speech Therapy Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 ✓4 3 2 1	This vendor's therapists meet the contractual arrangement.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 ✓4 3 2 1	No comments in this area.
Business Relations	5 4 ✓3 2 1	I get an immediate response from this vendor when situations suggest a need for administrative management.
Customer Satisfaction	5 ✓4 3 2 1	Issues in this area are usually handled expeditiously.
Cost Control	✓5 4 3 2 1	I get periodic updates from Anna Munson alerting me of the contract status.
Average Score	4	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Speech Therapy Services	
Purpose of Contract: Speech Therapy Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No	
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$71 to \$73.	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$141,034	
Vendor Name: Career Staff Unlimited	Vendor Number: 600011370
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Yvonne R. Tate
Vendor: CareerStaff Unlimited		Vendor #: 600011370
Contract # / P.O/ #: 4500149178		Contract Name: Speech Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 141,034		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Speech Therapy Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	✓5 4 3 2 1	This vendor's therapists work above and beyond the contractual arrangement to meet the needs of our students (i.e., attend meetings).
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	✓5 4 3 2 1	No concerns in this area.
Business Relations	✓5 4 3 2 1	Direct contact with this vendor is never necessary.
Customer Satisfaction	✓5 4 3 2 1	The principals have called to ensure service provision by this vendor's hires. There has been no negative feedback received in my office regarding any staff employed by this vendor.
Cost Control	✓5 4 3 2 1	I get periodic updates from Anna Munson alerting me of the contract status.
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Speech Therapy Services	
Purpose of Contract: Speech Therapy Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No	
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$72.45 to \$76.07.	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$530,686	
Vendor Name: Cumberland Therapy Services	Vendor Number: 600007650
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Yvonne R. Tate
Vendor: Cumberland Therapy Services		Vendor #: 600007650
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149715		Contract Name: Speech Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 530,686		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Speech Therapy Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	✓5 4 3 2 1	This vendor's therapists work above and beyond the contractual arrangement to meet the needs of our students.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	✓5 4 3 2 1	This vendor calls often to ascertain needs or to upgrade services where possible.
Business Relations	✓5 4 3 2 1	Direct contact with this vendor is seldom necessary. I get immediate assistance from the home office when needed.
Customer Satisfaction	✓5 4 3 2 1	There has been no negative feedback received in my office regarding any staff employed by this vendor.
Cost Control	✓5 4 3 2 1	I get periodic updates from Anna Munson alerting me of the contract status.
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: Speech Therapy Services
Purpose of Contract: Speech Therapy Services to students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$71 to \$73.
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$20,590
Vendor Name: Childgarden Child Development Center Vendor Number: 600004605
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Sheryl Davenport
Vendor: Childgarden Child Development Center		Vendor #: 600004605
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149198		Contract Name: Speech Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 20,590		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Speech Therapy Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Highly qualified therapists, who like working with children.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Reliable and professional therapists with good attendance.
Business Relations	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	SLPS early childhood special education has a long established and positive relationship with Childgarden.
Customer Satisfaction	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Very satisfied
Cost Control	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Good
Average Score	<u>5</u>	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** June 3, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 08-06-09-14

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-35
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal for contracts for occupational and physical therapy services to be provided for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 with multiple vendors (listed below) at a cost not to exceed \$654,450.00.


BACKGROUND:

This is the second renewal of the contracts approved under RFP 044-0708 and RFP 045-0708. The agencies listed below will provide, on an "as needed" basis, occupational and/or physical therapy services to students with disabilities as identified by their Individual Education Program (IEP). Services are to include screenings for evaluations, participation in diagnostic staffing, IEP development and implementation. All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.


Supplemental Health Care, Mid-America Therapy, and Childgarden Child Development Center

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 134**MSIP:** 7.1.2**FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)**

Fund Source: 140-2132-6319-828-MZ	GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$654,450.00		
Fund Source: 270-1511-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source: 220-1243-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$654,450.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: Various

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones

Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: OT/PT Services
Purpose of Contract: Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Services to students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
If Yes explain Changes:
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$372,350
Vendor Name: Mid-America Therapy Vendor Number: 600005587
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: OT/PT Services	
Purpose of Contract: Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No	
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$54 to \$55.	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$376,350	
Vendor Name: Supplemental Health Care	Vendor Number: 600013310
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Sheryl Davenport
Vendor: Supplemental Health Care		Vendor #: 600013310
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149196		Contract Name: Occupational/Physical Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 376,350		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Occupational/Physical Therapy Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Excellent service
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	The contractor is provides qualified, reliable and professional therapists. When changes occurred they did not interrupt service to students.
Business Relations	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	The contractor meets with SLPS quarterly to review spending. Very responsive.
Customer Satisfaction	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Very satisfied
Cost Control	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Under budget
Average Score	<u>5</u>	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: OT/PT Services
Purpose of Contract: Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Services to students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$71 to \$73.
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$10,650
Vendor Name: Childgarden Child Development Center Vendor Number: 600004605
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: OT/PT Services
Purpose of Contract: Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy Services to students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$71 to \$73.
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$10,650
Vendor Name: Childgarden Child Development Center Vendor Number: 600004605
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Sheryl Davenport
Vendor: Childgarden Child Development Center		Vendor #: 600004605
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149198		Contract Name: Occupational/Physical Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 10,650		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Occupational/Physical Therapy Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Highly qualified therapists, who like working with children.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Reliable and professional therapists with good attendance.
Business Relations	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	SLPS early childhood special education has a long established and positive relationship with Childgarden.
Customer Satisfaction	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Very satisfied
Cost Control	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Good
Average Score	<u>5</u>	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: May 27, 2010

To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

From: Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 09-10-09-06

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-36
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal for contracts for private placement services to be provided for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 with multiple vendors (listed below) at a cost not to exceed \$2,840,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

This is the second renewal of the contracts approved under RFP 050-0708. The agencies listed below will provide, on an "as needed" basis, private placement services to students with disabilities as identified by their Individual Education Program (IEP). Services are to include specialized instruction and therapy, IEP development and implementation. All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.

The District is currently building a program to support these students at District-owned sites.

Edgewood Children's Home, Epworth Children and Family Services, Evangelical Children's Home, St. Vincent School, Annie Malone - Emerson Academy, and Logos School.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance

Row: 134

MSIP: 7.1.2

FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 270-1232-6311-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$2,840,000.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$2,840,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: Various

Department: Special Education

Requestor: Dr. Chip Jones

Carlinda Purcell

Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

Angela Banks

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Private Placement Services	
Purpose of Contract: Private Placement Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No	
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$116 to \$120.	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$985,600	
Vendor Name: Edgewood Children's Center	Vendor Number: 600004154
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Rumell Lomack
Vendor: Edgewood Children's Center		Vendor #: 600004154
Contract # / P.O. / #: 4500149136		Contract Name: Private Placement Services
Contract Amount: \$ 730,800		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Private Placement Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	-5	This agency offers a variety of services. This agency has a good team concept.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5	Materials are received in a timely manner.
	-4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Business Relations	-5	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Customer Satisfaction	-5	The rapport with the parents excellent. Parents rarely want their child to transition to another school/location.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Cost Control	-5	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period. <div style="text-align: right;"> Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> </div>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: Private Placement Services
Purpose of Contract: Private Placement Services to students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$125 to \$130.
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$480,000
Vendor Name: Epworth Children and Family Services Vendor Number: 600004155
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Rumell Lomack
Vendor: Epworth Children and Family Services		Vendor #: 600004155
Contract # / P.O. / #: 4500149203		Contract Name: Private Placement Services
Contract Amount: \$ 375,000		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Private Placement Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	-5 4 3 2 1	This agency has not refused any student that we have sent. They seek to find various methods to meet the individual needs.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	-5 4 3 2 1	Materials are received and responded to in a timely manner.
Business Relations	-5 4 3 2 1	This agency is always professional and polite even when changes are made immediately from this office.
Customer Satisfaction	-5 4 3 2 1	Great customer relationship with all involved and will go that extra mile.
Cost Control	-5 4 3 2 1	Cost effective for the type of severe students that they will take when other agencies may not be able to accommodate.
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: Private Placement Services
Purpose of Contract: Private Placement Services to students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$85.50 to \$88.
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$581,000
Vendor Name: Evangelical Children's Home Vendor Number: 600003682
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Rumell Lomack
Vendor: Evangelical Children's Home		Vendor #: 600003682
Contract # / P.O. / #: 4500149205		Contract Name: Private Placement Services
Contract Amount: \$ 199,125		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Private Placement Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	-5 4 3 2 1	This agency involves the community, professional authors, retired teachers to support the quality and services for the students.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	-5 4 3 2 1	This agency responds in a timely manner on documents that needed for this office.
Business Relations	-5 4 3 2 1	Great business relationship. The director exemplifies professionalism and set the bar for staff members.
Customer Satisfaction	-5 4 3 2 1	Parents appear appreciative of services received.
Cost Control	-5 4 3 2 1	
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: Private Placement Services
Purpose of Contract: Private Placement Services to students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$100 to \$103.
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$873,000
Vendor Name: St. Vincent School Vendor Number: 600004228
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Rumell Lomack
Vendor: St. Vincent School		Vendor #: 600004228
Contract # / P.O. / #: 4500149137		Contract Name: Private Placement Services
Contract Amount: \$ 500,000		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Private Placement Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	-5	The students that are in St. Vincent care receive quality services due to the dedication of staff and others.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	-5	St Vincent is one that always meet the deadline of this office.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Business Relations	-5	St. Vincent has demonstrated excellent professionalism.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Customer Satisfaction	-5	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Cost Control	-5	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: Private Placement Services
Purpose of Contract: Private Placement Services to students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$103 to \$105.
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$1,067,000
Vendor Name: Annie Malone-Emerson Academy Vendor Number: 600003719
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Rumell Lomack
Vendor: Annie Malone-Emerson Academy		Vendor #: 600003719
Contract # / P.O. / #: 4500149125		Contract Name: Private Placement Services
Contract Amount: \$ 618,000		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Private Placement Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	-5	This agency provides dedication and grave services to the students. The students are a priority.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	-5	The director of this agency is very conscientious about timely documents needed and distributed.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Business Relations	-5	This agency exhibits quality relationship with this office and others.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Customer Satisfaction	-5	Parents are constantly calling to place there children in this school because of the excellent services that was provided.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Cost Control	-5	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period. <div style="text-align: right;"> Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> </div>		



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Private Placement Services	
Purpose of Contract: Private Placement Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract X Yes No	
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increased from \$118 to \$123.	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$688,170	
Vendor Name: Logos School	Vendor Number: 600000790
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Rumell Lomack
Vendor: Logos School		Vendor #: 600000790
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149135		Contract Name: Private Placement Services
Contract Amount: \$ 708,000		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Private Placement Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	-5 4 3 2 1	This agency works as a team to meet student's individual needs.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	-5 4 3 2 1	Materials are received and responded to in a timely manner.
Business Relations	-5 4 3 2 1	This agency exemplifies excellence from the secretary to other employees.
Customer Satisfaction	-5 4 3 2 1	The motto of this agency is that "Logos saves Lives". I have heard the story over and over how this school has transformed and saved many children.
Cost Control	-5 4 3 2 1	
Average Score	5	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: May 27, 2010

To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

From: Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 08-06-09-16

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-37
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal with Listening For Learning to provide audiology services to students with disabilities for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$40,125.00.

BACKGROUND:

Listening For Learning provides, on an "as needed" basis, audiology services to students with disabilities as identified by the Individual Education Program (IEP). Services are to include screenings for evaluations, participation in diagnostic staffing, IEP development and implementation. All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance **Row:** 134 **MSIP:** 7.1.2

FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 270-2132-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$40,125.00		
Fund Source: 270-1511-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source: 270-1243-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$40,125.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600010847

Department: Special Education

Requestor: Dr. Chip Jones

Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Audiology Services	
Purpose of Contract: Audiology Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract Yes X No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$37,500	
Vendor Name: Listening For Learning	Vendor Number: 600010847
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Sheryl Davenport
Vendor: Listening for Learning		Vendor #: 600010847
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149199		Contract Name: Audiology Services
Contract Amount: \$ 37,500		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Audiology Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Thorough and professional evaluations. Reports to the district and timely.
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Contractor's performance is excellent.
Business Relations	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Very good communication
Customer Satisfaction	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Very willing to and often attends meetings at schools, presents workshops and provides informative information to staff and families to help support decision-making.
Cost Control	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Good. Often provides services outside the scope of the contract.
Average Score	<u>5</u>	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 20, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 08-06-09-18

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-28
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal with Deaf Way Interpreting Services to provide sign language interpreting services to students with disabilities for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$187,200.00.

BACKGROUND:

Deaf Way Interpreting Services provides, on an "as needed" basis, audiology services to students with disabilities as identified by the Individual Education Program (IEP). Services are to include participation in IEP development and implementation. All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 134**MSIP:** 7.1.2**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 270-1222-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$187,200.00		
Fund Source: 270-1511-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source: 220-1222-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$187,200.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600000639

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones

Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Sign Language Services	
Purpose of Contract: Sign Language Services to students with disabilities	
Are there changes versus prior year contract Yes X No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$278,427	
Vendor Name: Deaf Way Interpreting Services	Vendor Number: 600000639
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Sheryl Davenport
Vendor: Deaf Way Interpreting Services		Vendor #: 600000639
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149179		Contract Name: Sign Language Interpreting Services
Contract Amount: \$ 208,820		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Sign Language Interpreting Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	<u>5</u>	Excellent sign language interpreters.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	<u>5</u>	Excellent response time to needs requests, particularly those that were short notice.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Business Relations	<u>5</u>	Very good, long established relationship. Prompt return of phone calls.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Customer Satisfaction	<u>5</u>	The consumers of the sign language interpreting service are pleased with the dedication and skill of the interpreters. Teachers like the professionalism of the individuals sent by Deaf Way.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Cost Control	<u>5</u>	Good cost control, under budget.
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	
Average Score	<u>5</u>	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 20, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 08-06-09-1

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-39
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal with International Institute to provide foreign language interpreting services to students and families for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$20,075.00.

BACKGROUND:

International Institute provides, on an "as needed" basis, foreign language interpreting services to students and families as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.


CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 134**MSIP:** 7.1.2**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)


Fund Source: 270-2132-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$20,075.00		
Fund Source: 270-1511-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source: 220-2132-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$20,075.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600004143

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones

 Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics


 Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


 Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


 Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Foreign Language Interpreting Services	
Purpose of Contract: Foreign Language Interpreting Services	
Are there changes versus prior year contract Yes X No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$15,750	
Vendor Name: International Institute	Vendor Number: 600004143
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: April 28, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Sheryl Davenport
Vendor: International Institute of Metro St. Louis		Vendor #: 600004143
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149180		Contract Name: Foreign Language Interpreting Services
Contract Amount: \$ 15,750		Award Date: July 1, 2008
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): Provide Foreign Language Interpreting Services to assigned students		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Very qualified interpreters
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Interpreters arrive on time to meetings and conferences.
Business Relations	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Very good.
Customer Satisfaction	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Very satisfied
Cost Control	<u>5</u> 4 3 2 1	Good
Average Score	<u>5</u>	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: May 28, 2010

To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

From: Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 10-08-09-04

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-40
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal with Midwest Music Therapy Services, Inc. to provide music therapy services to students with disabilities for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$47,500.00.

BACKGROUND:

Midwest Music Therapy Services, Inc. provides, on an "as needed" basis, music therapy service to students with disabilities as identified by their Individual Education Program (IEP). Service to include evaluation and assessments, specialized instruction, therapy and IEP implementation. All services are to be provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education. The incidence of students with this related service need as outlined in the IEP is increasing. This is in part due to the increase in the incidence of autism.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance

Row: 134

MSIP: 7.1.2

FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 270-2132-6319-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$47,500.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$47,500.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600013853


Department: Special Education

Requestor: Dr. Chip Jones


Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics


Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones
Name of Contract: Music Therapy Services
Purpose of Contract: Music Therapy Services for students with disabilities
Are there changes versus prior year contract <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes explain Changes: Rate per hour increases from \$56 to \$58.
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$19,600
Vendor Name: Midwest Music Therapy Services, Inc. Vendor Number: 600013853
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
Superintendent Signature

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: May 17, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Chip Jones
Vendor: Midwest Music Therapy Services, Inc.		Vendor #: 600013853
Contract # / P.O. #: 4500149450		Contract Name: Music Therapy Services
Contract Amount: \$ 19,600.00		Award Date: 10/8/09
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): To provide music therapy services for those students who are identified with a need in their IEP.		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Business Relations	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Customer Satisfaction	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Cost Control	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Average Score	5.0	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 27, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 09-10-09-05

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-41
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal with Alternative Unlimited to provide short-term alternative day placement services for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$495,000.00.


BACKGROUND:

Alternatives Unlimited will provide, on an "as needed" basis, short-term alternative day placement services to students with disabilities as identified by their Individual Education Program (IEP). The services will include specialized instruction and therapy and IEP implementation provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.


CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:** 133**MSIP:** 7.1.2**FUNDING SOURCE:** (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 270-1232-6311-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$495,000.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$495,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600008393

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones


 Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics


 Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director


 Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer


 Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent





Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Short-term disciplinary placement services	
Purpose of Contract: Short-term disciplinary placement services	
Are there changes versus prior year contract Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$495,000	
Vendor Name: Alternatives Unlimited	Vendor Number: 600008393
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: May 17, 2010	
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Chip Jones	
Vendor: Alternatives Unlimited		Vendor #: 600008393	
Contract # / P.O/ #: 4500149140		Contract Name: Short-Term Alternative Day Placement	
Contract Amount: \$ 495,000.00		Award Date: 9/10/09	
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): To provide on an "as needed basis", short-term alternative day placement services to students with disabilities.			
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory			
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)	
Quality of Goods / Services	5 + 4 3 2 1		
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 + 4 3 2 1		
Business Relations	5 + 4 3 2 1		
Customer Satisfaction	5 + 4 3 2 1		
Cost Control	5 4 + 3 2 1		
Average Score	4.8	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.	
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.			
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>			

**SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Date:** May 24, 2010**To:** Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent**From:** Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics**VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:**

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 09-10-09-05

Agenda Item: _____
 Information: _____☐
 Conference: _____☐
 Action: _____☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal with Alternative Unlimited to provide short-term alternative day placement services for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$495,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

Alternative Unlimited will provide, on an "as needed" basis, short-term alternative day placement services to students with disabilities as identified by their Individual Education Program (IEP). The services will include specialized instruction and therapy and IEP implementation provided at sites and times as directed by the Office of Special Education.

CSIP: Goal 2: Process Performance**Row:****MSIP:** 7.1.2**FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)**

Fund Source: 270-1232-6311-828-00	Non-GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$495,000.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$495,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600008393

Department: Special Education**Requestor:** Dr. Chip Jones

Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Date: June 3, 2010

To: Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent

From: Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

VENDOR SELECTION METHOD:

- ☐ RFP/Bid
☐ Sole Source
☒ Contract Renewal
☐ Ratification

Previous Bd. Res. #: 04-29-10-08

Agenda Item: 06-24-10-42
 Information: ☐
 Conference: ☐
 Action: ☒

SUBJECT:

To approve a contract renewal with the Institute For Family Medicine to provide services to the District as the Medical Director for the Office of Health Services. The services will be provided for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 at a cost not to exceed \$8,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

The Institute For Family Medicine provides the services of Dr. David Campbell as the Medical Director for the District. The Medical Director provides standing medical orders for the professional registered nurses employed as school nurses and directs patient health care services to students through the utilization of Family Nurse Practitioners.

CSIP: Goal 1: Performance

Row:

MSIP:

9.6

FUNDING SOURCE: (ex: 110 Fund Type – 2218 Function– 6411 Object Code - 111 Location Code – 00 Project Code)

Fund Source: 110-2134-6312-880-00	GOB	Requisition #:
Amount: \$8,000.00		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Fund Source:		Requisition #:
Amount:		
Cost not to Exceed: \$8,000.00	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending Funding Availability	Vendor #: 600012168

Department: Special Education

Requestor: Dr. Chip Jones

Carlinda Purcell

Dr. Carlinda Purcell, Dep. Supt., Academics

Angela Banks

Angela Banks, Interim Budget Director

Enos Moss

Enos Moss, CFO/Treasurer

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams

Dr. Kelvin R. Adams, Superintendent



Request for Contract Renewal Form

Date of Submittal: May 17, 2010	
Name of Department Head submitting Request: Dr. Chip Jones	
Name of Contract: Medical Director Services	
Purpose of Contract: To provide the services of the Medical Director for the District and to establish a school based clinic.	
Are there changes versus prior year contract Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes explain Changes:	
Total Cost of Contract (estimated cost of expenses inclusive): \$12,000	
Vendor Name: Institute For Family Medicine	Vendor Number: 600012168
Start Date of Contract: July 1, 2009	
Expiration Date of Contract: June 30, 2010	
Department Responsible for Vendor Performance Monitoring: Special Education	
Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
Superintendent Signature	

Please attach the Vendor Performance Report and Proposed Contract



Vendor Performance Report

Type of report: Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/>		Report Date: May 17, 2010
Dept / School: Special Education		Reported By: Chip Jones
Vendor: Institute For Family Medicine		Vendor #: 600012168
Contract # / P.O. / #:		Contract Name: Medical Director Services
Contract Amount: \$ 12,000.00		Award Date: 4/29/10
Purpose of Contract (Brief Description): To provide the services of the Medical Director for the District and to establish a school based clinic.		
Performance Ratings: Summarize the vendor's performance and circle the number which best describes their performance in that category. See Vendor Performance Report Instructions for explanations of categories and numeric ratings (<i>please attach additional sheets if necessary</i>). Ratings 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory		
Category	Rating	Comments (Brief)
Quality of Goods / Services	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Timeliness of Delivery or Performance	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Business Relations	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Customer Satisfaction	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Cost Control	5 + 4 3 2 1	
Average Score	5.0	Add above ratings: divide the total by the number of areas being rated.
Would you select / recommend this vendor again? Please be aware that an answer of yes authorizes the Purchasing Department to seek renewal of the available option year for this contract. All items and conditions within the current contract shall be honored during this renewal period.		
Please Check Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		