

**BERNARDS TOWNSHIP BOARD OF EDUCATION
101 PEACHTREE ROAD
BASKING RIDGE, NJ 07920**

Summary of Proposals and Recommendation for Student Information System

Evaluator:

BRIAN HEINEMAN, DIRECTOR, CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Advisors

Christopher Barone, IT Director
Anita DeAngelis, School Nurse
Gina Donlevie, Assistant Principal
Kathy Fehn, School Secretary
Kristin Fox, Supervisor of Social Studies
Joanne Hozeny, Principal
Karen Hudock, Principal
Jillian Shadis, Supervisor, Counseling
Michele Vitiello, District Registrar
Maria Mensinger, Supervisor of Special Education

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

- I. Evaluation Process
- II. Analysis and Grading of Proposals
 - 1. Analysis of Bidder's Company Overview and Qualifications
 - 2. Analysis of Bidder's Ability to Satisfy RFP Requirements and Implement Project
 - 3. Analysis of Price Proposal
- III. Scoring Table and Ranking
- IV. Recommendation

I. Evaluation Process

The Bernards Township Board of Education issued a Request for Proposals (RFP), pursuant to provisions of law authorizing competitive contracting, for District-wide Student Information System (SIS) software and received 4 proposals in response to its RFP. The following are the names of the vendors that submitted proposals:

- Follett - Aspen
- Infinite Campus
- Oncourse
- Skyward

All proposals were evaluated and scored in accordance with the methodology described in the RFP. The evaluation was conducted by Brian Heineman, Director of Curriculum and Instruction.

An analysis of all proposals was done to verify that information requested in the RFP was included in all vendor proposals to confirm that the solution proposed corresponded to what was required in the RFP. Final review, scoring and recommendation was completed by Brian Heineman, Director of Curriculum and Instruction.

Consistent with the process outlined in the RFP, the 4 proposals were evaluated according to the criteria in Table No. 1 and a final score was calculated.

Table No. 1 – Evaluation Criteria

Criteria		Weight
Company Resources and Qualifications (25%)	Vendor's Capability, Experience and Expertise	5
	Vendor's financial stability	2
	Vendor's National and New Jersey track record	7
	Resources that will be allocated to the project	7
	Vendor's References	4
Ability to Satisfy RFP Requirements and Implement Project (50%)	Implementation Services and Training Plan	10
	Technical Requirements	5
	General Requirements	3
	Reporting	3
	Demographics	1
	Attendance	1
	Discipline	1
	Enroll and Withdraw	1
	Grades and Transcripts	1
	Health	1
	Scheduling	5
	Special Education	3
	Assessment	5
	Teacher Gradebook	3
Family Access	3	
Integration	4	
Overall Cost (25%)		25

In grading RFP requirements, the rubric listed in Table No. 2 was utilized.

Table No. 2

Score	Criteria
4	Vendor is able to meet all specified requirements, provides details and supporting documentation, and offers no major caveats according to the evaluator.
3	Vendor is able to meet most of the specified requirements, provides details, and offers only minor major caveats according to the evaluator.
2	Vendor is able to meet some specified requirements and provides some details. Proposal contains several caveats according to the evaluator.
1	Vendor is only able to meet few specified requirements and provides no details. Proposal contains several major caveats according to the evaluator.
0	The proposal does not provide needed information or contains so many caveats to be non-viable

II. Analysis and Grading of Proposals

This section provides a narrative of each area evaluated indicating the reasoning behind the grading given to each proposal.

1. Analysis of Bidder's Company Overview and Qualifications

- All vendors' proposals reflected sufficient experience in implementing their SIS and qualified personnel to complete the project in a timely fashion.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	20
Skyward	20
Infinite Campus	20
Oncourse	20

Bidder's Financial Stability

- Based on the information provided in the proposals, Follett is the largest and most stable company with a revenue of 3.7 billion dollars. All companies responding to the RFP demonstrated more than adequate financial stability to support the proposal.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	8
Skyward	8
Infinite Campus	8
Oncourse	8

Bidder's Track Record

- Three of the four bidders fully met the criteria with a well-established track record in large school districts over a long period of time. Follett has been in business for 140 years and its Aspen SIS is in use by 173 districts in 15 states including Boston, Chicago and Miami Dade County. They maintain a 99% retention rate with districts that utilize their Aspen SIS. Custom Computer Specialists - Infinite Campus has been in business since 1993 and is utilized in 2,000 school districts. Skyward has been in business since 1981 and is in use by 1,900 districts.
- OnCourse has been in business since 2002 and as a newer vendor has yet to fully establish its SIS across a large number of districts over a long period of time.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	28
Skyward	28
Infinite Campus	28
Oncourse	21

Resources That Will Be Allocated to the Project

- Each proposal identified a skilled team that would be in charge of implementation. Each responding vendor proposed an appropriate and detailed implementation plan with benchmarks.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	28
Skyward	28
Infinite Campus	28
Oncourse	28

Bidder's References

- All responding vendors met the RFP criteria and supplied multiple references in NJ and a list of similar sized clients using the product.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	16
Skyward	16
Infinite Campus	16
Oncourse	16

2. Analysis of Bidder's Ability to Satisfy RFP Requirements and Implement Project

Proposals were evaluated in 16 different areas to determine each vendor's ability to satisfy RFP requirements and implement the project. Each of these areas is discussed below.

Implementation of Services and Training Plan

- Each vendor was able to meet the majority of the requirements of the RFP. Each vendor had minor caveats that would have to be considered if the system was adopted.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	30
Skyward	30
Infinite Campus	30
Oncourse	30

Technical Requirements

- Both Skyward and Aspen were able to meet the criteria set forth in the RFP with only minor caveats noted. OnCourse lacked an enterprise level disaster recovery plan and offered weaker encryption protocols. Infinite Campus lacked some detail to its answers and charged additional cost for audit logs.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	15
Skyward	15
Infinite Campus	10
Oncourse	10

General Requirements

- Aspen was the only vendor that was able to meet all of the RFP requirements with no caveats. Infinite Campus met most of the criteria but had limitations in its help system as well as appointments. Both Skyward and Oncourse lacked the ability to track workflow and schedule appointments.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	12
Skyward	6
Infinite Campus	9
Oncourse	6

Reporting

- Aspen, Infinite Campus and OnCourse were able to meet the majority of the RFP requirements with only some minor caveats. Skyward noted several NJ SMART reports that were not generated by the system and some report viewing not native to the system.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	9
Skyward	6
Infinite Campus	9
Oncourse	9

Demographics

- Three of the vendors were able to meet all of the RFP requirements with no caveats. OnCourse noted several major caveats related to data associated with families that have multiple students in the district as well as data from a student's prior school.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	4
Skyward	4
Infinite Campus	4
Oncourse	1

Attendance

- Aspen was able to meet the requirements set forth in the RFP with no caveats. The other three vendors had various, though minor, caveats in the way attendance is viewed in the system or its ability to generate letters based on attendance.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	4
Skyward	3
Infinite Campus	3
Oncourse	3

Discipline

- Aspen presented the most detailed discipline system including a method to track incremental discipline. Skyward and Infinite Campus both offered minor caveats in their implementation. Oncourse offered many of the items needed, but listed many caveats

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	4
Skyward	3
Infinite Campus	3
Oncourse	2

Enroll and Withdraw

- Three of the vendors met the full requirements of the RFP with no caveats. Oncourse noted issues with identifying duplicate enrollments and determining academic eligibility.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	4
Skyward	4
Infinite Campus	4
Oncourse	2

Grades and Transcripts

- Aspen was able to meet all of the requirements noted in the RFP. Both Skyward and Infinite Campus met the majority of the requirements but had several minor caveats. Oncourse was missing many items required by the RFP.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	4
Skyward	3
Infinite Campus	3
Oncourse	2

Health

- Both Aspen and Skyward offered systems that fully met the requirements of the RFP. Infinite Campus was able to meet the majority of the requirements but had a few caveats. Oncourse had many caveats and only met a few of the specified requirements.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	4
Skyward	4
Infinite Campus	3
Oncourse	2

Scheduling

- Both Aspen and Skyward met the majority of the requirements noted in the RFP and have feature rich scheduling and report elements. While Infinite Campus met the majority of the requirements of the RFP it has some caveats that would make it difficult to adapt to our particular middle school model. Oncourse met several of the requirements but had many critical pieces missing from its ability to report on the process.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	20
Skyward	20
Infinite Campus	15
Oncourse	10

Special Education

- While all vendors were able to provide potential solutions for special education, they also presented a wide variety of caveats for successful implementation. No system seemed to provide a better alternative to the current IEP system - IEP Direct.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	6
Skyward	6
Infinite Campus	6
Oncourse	6

Assessment

- Aspen was the only proposal that did not identify any caveats with the implementation of assessments in the SIS. Skyward was able to meet many of the requirements, but had several caveats regarding internal assessments. Infinite Campus and Oncourse had a variety of minor and major caveats regarding the implementation of this part of the SIS.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	20
Skyward	15
Infinite Campus	10
Oncourse	5

Teacher Gradebook

- Aspen presented the most comprehensive gradebook system and allowed for the greatest flexibility in grading and planning. The other three vendors were able to meet most of the requirements of the RFP but each had minor caveats based on the proposals.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	12
Skyward	9
Infinite Campus	9
Oncourse	9

Family Access

- Three of the vendors’ proposals were able to meet the criteria set forth in the RFP with no caveats. Oncourse was not able to meet many of the requested criteria including embedded email to students linked to related staff and form tracking for students.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	12
Skyward	12
Infinite Campus	12
Oncourse	6

Integration

- Three of the respondents offered integration solutions with a variety of minor caveats, but overall presented acceptable models of integration. Skyward’s proposal was less clear and required the use of a specific proprietary utility in many cases.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	12
Skyward	8
Infinite Campus	12
Oncourse	12

3. Analysis of Overall Cost

Each proposal supplied an implementation and conversion cost as well as ongoing costs for a hosted SIS service. It is not possible to compare costs perfectly since the packaging of various systems along with training and ongoing services is difficult to match between vendors. The greatest amount of on-site training was provided by Aspen which had the second lowest overall cost. Oncourse had less training packaged but offered the lowest costs of all proposals. The initial implementation year had costs including a multitude of factors (training, planning, data conversion services) while the yearly costs gave the best approximation of the on-going costs the district would need to account for with the SIS service.

Vendor	Weighted Score
Aspen	75
Skyward	50
Infinite Campus	25
Oncourse	100

The table below shows the estimate of the actual cost to the District of each proposal for year 1 (Implementation), and subsequent years thereafter (yearly cost). The table also shows the total cost after 5 years running the system.

Vendor	Initial	Yearly (Year 2+)	5 Year Cost
Aspen	111,100	47,300	300,300
Skyward	123,736	62,835	437,911
Infinite Campus	69,400	64,133	325,932
Oncourse	51,800	42,000	219,800

III. Scoring Table and Ranking

Evaluation Criteria		Weight	ASPEN		SKYWARD		INFINITE CAMPUS		ONCOURSE	
			Points	Weighted	Points	Weighted	Points	Weighted	Points	Weighted
Company Resources and Qualifications (25%)	Capability, Experience and Expertise	5	4	20	4	20	4	20	4	20
	Financial Stability	2	4	8	4	8	4	8	4	8
	National and NJ Track Record	7	4	28	4	28	4	28	3	21
	Resources Allocated to Project	7	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28
	References	4	4	16	4	16	4	16	4	16
Ability to Satisfy RFP Requirements and Implement Project (50%)	Implementation Services and Training Plan	10	3	30	3	30	3	30	3	30
	Technical Requirements	5	3	15	3	15	2	10	2	10
	General Requirements	3	4	12	2	6	3	9	2	6
	Reporting	3	3	9	2	6	3	9	3	9
	Demographics	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1
	Attendance	1	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Discipline	1	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	2
	Enroll and Withdraw	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2
	Grades and Transcripts	1	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	2
	Health	1	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2
	Scheduling	5	4	20	4	20	3	15	2	10
	Special Education	3	2	6	2	6	2	6	2	6
	Assessment	5	4	20	3	15	2	10	1	5
	Teacher Gradebook	3	4	12	3	9	3	9	3	9
	Family Access	3	4	12	4	12	4	12	2	6
Integration	4	3	12	2	8	3	12	3	12	
Overall Cost (25%)		25	3	75	2	50	1	25	4	100
Total Score (Weighted)		100%		86.75		74.5		66.75		77.0

Final Ranking of Vendors:

Ranking	Bidder	Score
1	Aspen	86.75
2	Oncourse	77.0
3	Skyward	74.5
4	Infinite Campus	66.75

IV. Recommendation

After review of all vendor proposals based on the criteria listed in the RFP for the student information system (SIS) and analyzing each component thoroughly, the scoring identified Aspen by Follett as the SIS most likely to successfully meet the needs determined by BTSD.

Only minor caveats were encountered throughout the proposal and most could be easily addressed via customization. In addition to the core SIS functions of scheduling, grading, attendance, and family access, the workflow tracking is excellent and represents a major benefit to the productivity of the district. Aspen's ability to easily query the database in multiple ways allows for fast access to data and true data based decision making opportunities. The system was the most customizable SIS and allows us the option to utilize 3rd parties or built in solutions as BTSD sees fit.

While it is a newer player in New Jersey, Aspen is being used by very large districts like Boston, Chicago and Miami-Dade County. It was the largest and perhaps most secure company in the bid process and provided the most modern technology solution and robust support system. The references in New Jersey were overwhelmingly positive in the implementation of Aspen. Overall cost was the second lowest of the 4 submitted proposals and provides an excellent cost to value proposition.

Based on the results of the scoring process, it is proposed that the district should move forward with selecting Follett's Aspen to replace the current SIS.