

Part 1: Wireless Upgrade					
Company:			Evaluator:		
Scoring Criteria	Weight	Scale	Scale Description	Raw Score	
Price	16%				
Criteria Details: As required by USAC, this will be the highest weighted criteria. *For a fair cost comparison when scoring total bid prices, all bids with multi-year support contracts will have their total price reduced to reflect one year support cost.			0		
			1		
			2		
			3		
			4		
Quality of Design	15%				
Criteria Details: *Meets and/or exceeds the stated requirements listed in the RFP *Design conforms to reasonable wireless design best practices in a K-12 educational environment *Design reflects a good understanding of district's environment and needs *Design accounts for reasonable future growth *Provides, where most critical, reasonable resiliency compared to cost			0	Does not meet any of the stated requirements	
			1	Meets a few of the stated requirements	
			2	Meets most, but not all, the stated requirements	
			3	Meets the minimum stated requirements	
			4	Meets and exceeds the stated requirements	
Quality/Reputation/Compatibility/Features of Product/Services	15%				
Criteria Details: *Feedback from product reviews and evaluations *Products' performance and reliability can be verified by references from environments similar to the district *Product will be compatible with the design of the district's network and the equipment attached to its network *Product provides multiple useful features to meet current and future network needs			0	Product is Unknown or Consumer grade or not compatible with our network	
			1	Few and/or poor company/product reviews and/or product is not compatible with our network design	
			2	Product is considered a "low-end" enterprise product and/or receives mixed reviews and/or has limited compatibility with our network design	
			3	Product is considered a "mid-class" enterprise product and receives high percentage of favorable reviews and is compatible with our network design	
			4	Product is considered "best-in-class" and receives high percentage of favorable reviews and is compatible with our network design	
Fringe Benefits of Product/Services	6%				
Criteria Details: *Product includes additional useful product features (examples: Application level visibility and control, built-in heat mapping.) *Bidder provides useful additional included add-on services			0	No fringe benefits	
			1	Fringe benefits offered are not useful to the district	
			2	Fringe benefits are limited and only partially useful to the district	
			3	Provides at least 1 current/future useful fringe benefit to the district	
			4	Provides 1 current/future very useful and/or multiple useful fringe benefits to the district	
Quality of Engineering/Implementation Team	15%				
Criteria Details: *Is sized appropriately to engineer and implement in a timely manner *Is reasonable to schedule *Quality of work *Implementation timeframes *Expertise and experience in design and implementation *References			0	Does not offer engineering/implementation team	
			1	Engineering/Implementation team: • is inadequately small • and/or very difficult to schedule • and/or provides poor/mediocre quality work • and/or does not have (or has a poor) track record of providing reasonable implementation timeframes • and/or expertise and experience are limited • and/or has very few or poor references	

			2	Engineering/Implementation team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is minimally adequate • and/or difficult to schedule • and/or provides mediocre quality work • and/or does not have (or has a mixed) track record of providing reasonable implementation timeframes • and/or expertise and experience are only moderate • and/or has few or mixed review references 	
			3	Engineering/Implementation team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • size is moderate • is reasonable to schedule • performs high quality work • provides (and has a track record) of providing reasonable implementation timeframes • expertise and experience are high • has many good references 	
			4	Engineering/Implementation team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • size is moderate to large • is reasonable to schedule • performs high quality work • provides (and has a track record) of providing very quick implementation timeframes • expertise and experience are very high • has many good references 	
Terms-of-Service		13%			
Criteria Details:			0	Terms offer no flexibility to adjust as needed	
*Flexibility of contract terms to adjust for district budget and/or E-Rate funding changes			1	Terms provide a small amount of flexibility but with a penalty	
*Flexibility of contract terms to adjust for changes in the needs of district network			2	Terms provide a large amount of flexibility but with a penalty	
*Flexibility of contract terms to adjust for changes in product bid			3	Terms provide a small amount of flexibility to adjust as needed with no penalty	
			4	Terms provide a large amount of flexibility to adjust as needed with no penalty	
On-Going Support Costs		15%			
Criteria Details:			0		
*Cost of future year Warranty/Support costs (including firmware/software upgrades)			1		
*Product provides reasonable flexibility on how and what products will need extended support			2		
			3		
			4		
Post Implementation Support and Training of District/Other Personnel		5%			
Criteria Details:			0	No Training included and/or No Support Options available	
*Training is offered to Lebanon Community School District #9 and other support personnel (ex: Linn-Benton-Lincoln Education Service District Technology Personnel)			1	Minimal Training included and/or Minimal Support Options included and/or available	
*On-going support options are included and/or available			2	Moderate Training included and Moderate Support Options included and/or available	
			3	Acceptable Training included and acceptable Support Options included and/or available	
			4	Extensive Training included and extensive Support Options included and/or available	

Part 1: Cabling Upgrade				
Company:				Evaluator:
Scoring Criteria	Weight	Scale	Scale Description	Raw Score
Price	17%			
Criteria Details: As required by USAC, this will be the highest weighted criteria.		0		
		1		
		2		
		3		
		4		
Quality of Design	16%			
Criteria Details: *Meets and/or exceeds the stated requirements listed in the RFP *Design conforms to standards and data cabling best practices outlined in the RFP		0	Does not meet any of the stated requirements	
		1	Meets a few of the stated requirements	
		2	Meets most, but not all, the stated requirements	
		3	Meets the minimum stated requirements	
		4	Meets and exceeds the stated requirements	
Quality/Reputation/Compatibility/Features of Product/Services	16%			
Criteria Details: *Products used are from a reputable manufacturer *Products are standardized across project *Feedback from product reviews and evaluations *Products' performance and reliability can be verified by references from environments similar to the district		0	Product is Unknown or Consumer grade or not compatible with our network	
		1	Few and/or poor company/product reviews and/or product is not compatible with our network design	
		2	Product is considered a "low-end" enterprise product and/or receives mixed reviews and/or has limited compatibility with our network design	
		3	Product is considered a "mid-class" enterprise product and receives high percentage of favorable reviews and is compatible with our network design	
		4	Product is considered "best-in-class" and receives high percentage of favorable reviews and is compatible with our network design	
Fringe Benefits of Product/Services	7%			
Criteria Details: *Bidder provides useful additional included add-on services		0	No fringe benefits	
		1	Fringe benefits offered are not useful to the district	
		2	Fringe benefits are limited and only partially useful to the district	
		3	Provides at least 1 current/future useful fringe benefit to the district	
		4	Provides 1 current/future very useful and/or multiple useful fringe benefits to the district	
Quality of Engineering/Implementation Team	16%			
Criteria Details: *Is sized appropriately to engineer and implement in a timely manner *Is reasonable to schedule *Quality of work *Implementation timeframes *Expertise and experience in design and implementation *References		0	Does not offer engineering/implementation team	
		1	Engineering/Implementation team: • is inadequately small • and/or very difficult to schedule • and/or provides poor/mediocre quality work • and/or does not have (or has a poor) track record of providing reasonable implementation timeframes • and/or expertise and experience are limited • and/or has very few or poor references	
		2	Engineering/Implementation team: • is minimally adequate • and/or difficult to schedule • and/or provides mediocre quality work • and/or does not have (or has a mixed) track record of providing reasonable implementation timeframes • and/or expertise and experience are only moderate • and/or has few or mixed review references	

			3	Engineering/Implementation team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • size is moderate • is reasonable to schedule • performs high quality work • provides (and has a track record) of providing reasonable implementation timeframes • expertise and experience are high • has many good references 	
			4	Engineering/Implementation team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • size is moderate to large • is reasonable to schedule • performs high quality work • provides (and has a track record) of providing very quick implementation timeframes • expertise and experience are very high • has many good references 	
Terms-of-Service		14%			
<u>Criteria Details:</u>			0	Terms offer no flexibility to adjust as needed	
*Flexibility of contract terms to adjust for district budget and/or E-Rate funding changes			1	Terms provide a small amount of flexibility but with a penalty	
*Flexibility of contract terms to adjust for changes in the needs of district network			2	Terms provide a large amount of flexibility but with a penalty	
*Flexibility of contract terms to adjust for changes in product bid			3	Terms provide a small amount of flexibility to adjust as needed with no penalty	
			4	Terms provide a large amount of flexibility to adjust as needed with no penalty	
Post Implementation Warranty/Problem Resolution		14%			
<u>Criteria Details:</u>			0	No Warranty and/or No Problem Resolution Plan	
*Plan for how post implementation issues are resolved			1	Minimal Warranty included and/or Poor Problem Resolution Plan	
*Warranty on work and products used			2	Moderately Acceptable Warranty included and Moderately Acceptable Resolution Plan	
			3	Acceptable Warranty included and Acceptable Resolution Plan	
			4	Extensive Warranty included and Excellent Resolution Plan	

LEBANON COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #9 Scoring Criteria Example

Part 1: Wireless Upgrade

Criteria	Max Score	Weight	Bidder A		Bidder B		Bidder C		Bidder D	
			Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
Price	4	16	4	64	3	48	2	32	4	64
Quality of Design	4	15	4	60	4	60	3	45	2	30
Quality/Reputation/Compatibility/Features of Product/Services	4	15	4	60	4	60	3	45	2	30
Fringe Benefits of Product/Services	4	6	2	12	3	18	2	12	4	24
Quality of Engineering/Implementation Team	4	15	4	60	4	60	3	45	3	45
Terms-of-Service	4	13	3	39	4	52	4	52	4	52
On-Going Support Costs	4	15	4	60	3	45	2	30	4	60
Post Implementation Support and Training of District/Other Personnel	4	5	4	20	3	15	3	15	4	20
Weighted Totals		100		375		358		276		325

Example Winning Bidder:
"Bidder A"

Part 2: Cabling Upgrade

Criteria	Max Score	Weight	Bidder A		Bidder B		Bidder C		Bidder D	
			Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
Price	4	17	4	68	3	51	2	34	4	68
Quality of Design	4	16	4	64	4	64	3	48	2	32
Quality/Reputation/Compatibility/Features of Product/Services	4	16	4	64	4	64	3	48	2	32
Fringe Benefits of Product/Services	4	7	2	14	3	21	2	14	4	28
Quality of Engineering/Implementation Team	4	16	4	64	4	64	3	48	3	48
Terms-of-Service	4	14	3	42	4	56	4	56	4	56
Post Implementation Warranty/Problem Resolution	4	14	4	56	3	42	3	42	4	56
Weighted Totals		100		372		362		290		320

Example Winning Bidder:
"Bidder A"