

Scoring Criteria

Price

Criteria Details:
 As required by USAC, this will be the highest weighted criteria. Price will be evaluated in relation to the district project budget of \$550,000.

**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.*

**Percentages will be rounded to the nearest percentage point.*

**Examples:*
 Bidder X:
 Price=\$440,000
 Percentage compared to budget:
 $(1 - (440,000/550,000)) = 20\%$ under budget
 Bidder X Score = 4

Bidder Z:
 Price=\$600,000
 Percentage compared to budget:
 $(1 - (600,000/550,000)) = 9\%$ over budget

Weight

Scale

Scale Description

15%

- 0 Equal to or greater than 25% over budget
- 1 Between 15% and 24 % over budget
- 2 Between 5% and 14% over budget
- 3 Between 4% under budget to 4% over budget
- 4 Over 5% under budget

Quality of Design

Criteria Details:
 *Meets and/or exceeds the stated requirements listed in the RFP

*Design conforms to reasonable best practices in a K-12 educational environment

*Design accounts for reasonable future growth based off of current usage metrics

*Provides, where most critical, reasonable resiliency compared to cost

14%

- 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

14%

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

5%

Criteria Details:

- *Product includes additional useful product features (examples: Software-Defined Networking (SDN), Network Management/Monitoring, VMWare Integration, etc.)

- *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

14%

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:
 - 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:
 - 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

LEBANON COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #9 Scoring Criteria

Terms-of-Service

12%

Criteria Details:

- *Flexibility of contract terms to adjust for district budget and/or E-Rate funding changes
- *Flexibility of contract terms to adjust for changes in the needs of district network

- 0 Terms offer no flexibility to adjust as needed
- 1 Terms provide a small amount of flexibility but with a penalty
- 2 Terms provide a large amount of flexibility but with a penalty
- 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

14%

Criteria Details:

- *Cost of future year Warranty/Support costs (including firmware/ios upgrades)
- *Product provides reasonable flexibility on how and what products will need extended support

- 0 \$40,000/per year or greater
- 1 \$25,000 - \$39,999/per year
- 2 \$15,000 - \$24,999/per year
- 3 \$10,000 - \$14,999/per year
- 4 \$0 - \$9,999/per year

Post Implementation Support and Training of District/Other Personnel

12%

Criteria Details:

- *Training is offered to Lebanon Community School District #9 and other support personnel (ex: Linn-Benton-Lincoln Education Service District Technology Personnel)
- *On-going support options are included and/or available

- 0 No Training included and/or No Support Options available
- 1 Minimal Training included and/or Minimal Support Options 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

LEBANON COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #9 Scoring Criteria Example

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	15	4	60	3	45	2	30	4	60
Quality of Design	4	14	4	56	4	56	3	42	2	28
Quality/Reputation/Compatibility/Features of Product/Services	4	14	4	56	4	56	3	42	2	28
Fringe Benefits of Product/Services	4	5	2	10	3	15	2	10	4	20
Quality of Engineering/Implementation Team	4	14	4	56	4	56	3	42	3	42
Terms-of-Service	4	12	3	36	4	48	4	48	4	48
On-Going Support Costs	4	14	4	56	3	42	2	28	4	56
Post Implementation Support and Training of District/Other Personnel	4	12	4	48	3	36	3	36	4	48
Weighted Totals		100		378		354		278		330

Example Winning Bidder:
"Bidder A"