

>> Okay.

So usual deal is not that much on the agenda this month in comparison to others.

I will do my usual thing and move relatively quickly.

And invite you to ask questions as you have them and slow me down at will.

The first item, actually the first two items are both scores.

The difference between the two are the originating procurement that / HE submitted their responses.

One was in response to a negotiated service solicitation, and the other one was a request for proposals.

In both cases, they were vendors that did not pass based on the scoring rubric.

The first time they submitted, they were bypassed.

We awarded a whole slough of prekindergarten contracts, as you know.

Since then, there were certain areas of particularly high need, where we wanted to have more programs.

So what we did was we gave vendors that met certain criteria, scoring criteria, the opportunity to resubmit and basically improve upon their offering, which not all, but some successfully did.

These awards are the product of just that.

That speaks to the first two items on the agenda.

The next item, item 3, is for ambulance services.

The amounts are very high in the solicitation.

You can see that the five-year cost for the different vendors are really very inflated because what we did was we had the vendors' price for all of the sort of area combinations that they might, but we really don't use that much ambulance service.

The bottom line is these are critical services that are provided to special education students, special need students, that actually need an ambulance to transport them to school.

There was a bid, and we received four bids in each of the seven areas, and the low bidder qualified for the award.

They provide quality ambulance services in various places already for various hospitals and the rest.

They passed our criteria to provide ambulance services.

So they'll replace the current vendor providing ambulance services to our special ed students.

Item 4 was withdrawn.

The fifth item on the agenda is an award of a contract with Permabond for library books and processing.

This is an additional vendor that will be added to a group of vendors that were already approved by the panel, I think, last month.

Is that right?

Last month?

Last month, the month before?

You don't know.

I think it was last month.

It might have been the month before.

For library books and processing.

Permabond was originally declined an award, not because of qualitative but because they didn't have capacity in terms of catalog offering. They filed a protest indicating it was not indicated up front in the solicitation that capacity would be a determinative award, and the protest panel found they were correct in that regard.

It's not an open and shut case, but I agree with that recommendation. They were able to provide services in the contract.

So they won.

Next, some of you may be familiar with Avanti's law, this is in compliance with that law for furnishing of locks and door alarms. We will subsequently be providing a contract for locks that is not subject to panel approval, but between the two, they will enable the department to comply with Avanti's law and enable schools that aren't required to have these locks and alarms, but still want to, at the middle and high school level, to do so at the school's option.

So that's that item.

The next one -- I'm going to take a break.

>> Can I ask a question?

>> Sure.

You said middle and high school but you meant middle and elementary schools?

>> So the requirement is that elementary and stand-alone district 75 schools -- and all district 75 schools have the alarms, and they're mandated to have the alarms, and it's extended further as an option to all schools.

So middle and high schools can if they opt to.

Next, you'll remember several months ago I came with a contract with Accenture.

Accenture was providing various services, consulting services, and helped with the rollout of the prekindergarten program, program implementation, and the rest.

This is an amendment to provide somewhat of an extension of services under that contract.

Basically, this amendment provides for transitioning program management to the overall 2015 work plan to the Department of Ed.

They're going to accomplish this by using tools and structures established for prekindergarten program for this past year's rollout, and they'll also transition the day-to-day systems work driven by the implementation of systems and improve efficiency.

We've extended their work with the department to some extent really so that they can seamlessly transfer their sort of knowledge and what they've been doing so the Department continues to do it on an ongoing basis.

It's an increase in the contract.

We'd already increased the contract by 10 percent.

This has to do with items already approved by the panel.

This is an additional \$232,000.

So the base amount of the contract was \$1.75 million, and this will take the contract up to \$2.15 million.

Total of about \$400,000 added.

And I will say I do think that that's going to be it for Accenture.

So it's not a massive increase to the contract amount, but an increase that will be helpful to the department.

>> And you have the report of the originals --

>> Yeah, there's no new.

Nothing new with that.

Whatever there was is disclosed.

-DELETE- -DELETE-

>> They have?

>> They've actually performed okay.

The next is a grant, as the next couple of items are.

First with L&G Research.

So it's like with many grants, it's the grantor has named the vendor to provide the services, and so it just happens to be an increase in the amount.

The next item, item 9, I want to be very up front with this.

This is a vendor named in grant.

So it's not like we had an option to go to another vendor, but it is a case where we actually, when we do background checks on Rainbow, we found certain problems where we were doing an award on a prekindergarten contract.

They had already started, as is often the case, grants are done retroactively.

That's not going to change.

By the time grant awards are done, services have already started.

So we're behind the eight ball right away.

So if there's an intractable retroactive contract problem, it's grants, and it's going to remain so until something changes in the way grants are doled out.

But the long and short in this particular case is after services had already been provided and we were well retro with this contract, we uncovered certain concerns in the prekindergarten contract.

So this particular award is just to pay them for the services already provided for the first year of services.

We're not continuing to use them on an ongoing basis despite the fact that we might have -- that's all I need to say on that.

The next item is with Vanguard Direct.

This is an interesting contract.

I'm sure you're all familiar, to some extent, with the high school application process, if you kids haven't gone through it, and this process has been extended downward to different grades, middle school and elementary schools, various levels, and more recently, prekindergarten.

So the original contract, the base contract we did with Vanguard was

actually for under \$10 million.

It was a \$9.7 million contract.

They performed fine.

They actually handle various aspects, including the running of the system that makes sure that the allocation of seats is done as we want them to be done.

But, of course, it's one of those contracts that, since it was originally developed and since they were originally engaged, we've continued to pour on more and more, and now this and now that.

So it has grown a lot.

So the new contract amount with the amendment that we're doing today takes the contract to \$22.6 million in total.

The actual amendment that I'm asking you to approve at this panel meeting is for just under \$1 million, \$994,000.

This particular amendment is largely pre-K driven.

All this paper showed up after I had my briefing materials earlier today.

But I had in front of me, I know before, what is -- I know where it is.

It's actually in this.

It's in the RA.

So just, for example, two-thirds or \$658,000 of the \$996,000 increase that you're looking at today is for the prekindergarten enrollment process.

It's through the changes that they're making to the system, families will have the ability to apply for not only existing pre-K programs, but for also additional new school and C back programs.

That's the additional code they did.

As with any complex system, it takes additional work to add new functionality to this already existing system.

So, again, it's alarms correctly go up when you look at a contract that started at a more modest level and has grown, but in the case of this particular contract, it has /KEUPTly grown because consistently grown because we've added a lot of additional functionality to the system along the way.

If you like, I can certainly share with you the additional functionality that built to the other substantial increases to the contract.

They're not dissimilar, including adding things like charter schools and English language learners and various other capacities to the application process that make it more complex.

The next item is another vendor named Grand BIG Education Fundamentals and another one with Research Foundation funded with a grant.

And finally, the last item is a listing application, or I should say plural listing applications with a half dozen publishing houses and these types of textbooks and other forms of content for the schools.

That's it.

-DELETE-

>> We have no questions here.

>> Okay.

>> That's it?

>> Yes.

Are we all okay with these things?

-DELETE-

>> I'll send the groupings.

>> You want to just send the groupings out?

>> Yeah.

I was going to put the UPK items together.

Do you want item 6 alone, the security Avante one?

>> I don't think there's anything controversial about it.

>> So the UPK and then everything else.

-DELETE-

>> Can we get them together?

>> I don't think there's anything crazy.

>> So 1 through --

>> I don't think there's any need to.

>> We don't have a complex item.

I don't think this particular month -- to me, if anything were going to be remotely contentious would be the Vanguard item because it amends a big contract for \$1 million that had already been -- I can tell the bad story.

The bad story is you start a contract under \$10 million, and now it's \$22 million.

The flip side of that is anybody who lives in this town that sends their kids to school understands the many things we've done to enhance and build on the application process and expand options for children. And that has driven the changes that have been necessary for this system.

So that's it.

>> Okay.