

RFQ 24- 001
Digitized Records RFQ
Executive Summary

RFQ 24- 001
Digitized Records RFQ
Executive Summary

Table of Content

Purpose	3
Background and Process	3
Evaluation Results	3
Ability to Execute and Service and Support	4
Technical Requirements	5
Cost Proposal	5
Decision Table	6
Conclusion	6
Evaluators Comments	Attachment

RFQ 24-002

Cloud-based Managed Print Services (CMPS)

Executive Summary

Purpose

DeKalb County School District (DCSD), Division of Information and Instructional Technology submitted a *Request for Quote (RFQ)* for responses from highly qualified, experienced, capable, and responsible offerors for the digitization of school and business records. This Request for Quotes (RFQ) documents DCSD's Digitization Records' objectives and the expectations that the respondents' solution, support, and pricing requirements are in accordance with the minimum requirements of this RFQ. The awarded offeror shall provide equipment and services in accordance with the scope of work, requirements and terms and conditions stated herein. Services shall include all labor, materials, tools, specialized equipment, supplies, trained personnel, and all other costs and charges in accordance with the requirements of this RFQ. There shall be no add-on charges of any kind.

The scope of this RFP is to select the best and most responsive respondent to implement a digital process for managing all school and business records. One of the major requirements is that all competitors must have a state, federal, or cooperative contract.

Background and Process

The evaluation team was made up of six staff members in the Division of Information and Instructional Technology (DIIT) and the Division of Equity and Student Empowerment (Student Assignment). One represented the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO), one represented DIIT Office of Innovation and Information, one represented DIIT Office of Student Information Systems (SIS), one represented the Project Management Office (PMO) – RFQ facilitator, and two represented the Office of School Assignments.

The solicitation was written in March/April 2024, published in April 2024 for two weeks, and evaluated May 2024 and will be submitted to the Board of Education for approval in June 2024. On May 10, 2024, the deadline for receiving responses, four vendors responded to the solicitation and three were deemed responsive and evaluated. DIIT posted RFQ 24-001 on Euna Bonfire website on April 26, 2024, on its UNSPSC Commodity Code site. Electronic notifications were sent to 112 vendors through Bonfire, 24 Takers (or those who downloaded the proposal), and 4 responses.

Evaluation Results

Based on a careful evaluation of how well each of the three possible choices/offerors could meet the four major criteria considered, Docufree Corporation appears to be the best choice. The three choices considered were:

Docufree Corporation

Access Information Management

Databank IMX, LLC

The criteria and point values used to evaluate the options are listed below:

Ability to Execute – 15 points

Service and Support – 20 points

Technical Requirements – 35 points

Cost Proposal – 30 points

Ability to Execute and Service and Support were the two most significant factors leading to the choice of Docufree Corporation over Access Information Management and Databank IMX, LLC. Although the scores were very close overall, the results indicates that Docufree Corporation is the best choice in providing the services needed for the district.

Ability to Execute and Service and Support

Between the two (criteria) their scores, in weight, are 35% of the total weight which is significant. The breakdown of the scores are displayed in the table below under the Evaluation Criteria column, where the highest score received as the best choice for Ability to Execute and Service and Support were 11.50 and 13.80 points respectively. The second-best score received 9.63 and 13.50 points, then the next received 7.50 and 12.80 points.

Evaluation Criteria	Total Weight	Docufree Corporation	Access Information Management	Databank IMX, LLC
Ability to Execute	15	11.50	7.50	9.63
Background and References	2	2	1.20	2
K12 Experience or Comparable-size to DCSD	3	2.50	.90	2.25
Years of Experience	2	1.80	.40	2
SLAs	3	2	1.20	1.13
Local Presence	2	1.40	1.40	.50
Federal, State, or Cooperative Contract	3	1.80	2.40	1.75

Service and Support	20	13.80	12.80	13.50
Disposition Plan	4	1.80	3	2.50
Digitization Process and Diagram (See Appendix PI)	7	4.40	4.40	5.50
List of staff and credential, providing services in DCSD	3	3	1	1
Training	6	4.60	4.40	4.50

Technical Requirements

Technical Requirements carried the largest weight, Databank IMX, LLC was the leader over Docufree Corporation and Access Information Management. However, both Databank IMX, LLC and Docufree Corporation weights were very close, and Docufree Corporation’s total points exceeds Access Information Management total.

Evaluation Criteria	Total Weight	Docufree Corporation	Access Information Management	Databank IMX, LLC
Technical Requirements	35	24.80	21.80	25.82
Product Offerings: Cloud, Hybrid, On-premise	6	4.60	5.60	3.50
Security:				
Disaster Recovery Plan	5	1.80	1.20	4.33
Compliant with current regulations and standards (i.e., FERPA, HIPA, etc.)	5	4.40	2.25	3.67
Interface (web-based or client application)	5	4.75	4	3.33
Scalability (Data Management #6)	4	3.25	2.75	3.33
Methodology on the security of digitization application	5	3.50	3.25	4.33
Storage strategy (Data Management)	5	2.50	2.75	3.33

Cost Proposal

The proposal quotes were presented as follows:

Evaluation Criteria	Docufree Corporation	Access Information Management	Databank IMX, LLC
Cost Proposal	Proposal Cost	Proposal Cost	Proposal Cost
All Costs - Total boxed and non-boxed scanning, Microfiche, Destruction of copies, Software, and Services	\$6,136,008.00	\$1,020,060.00	\$6,574,668.50

Evaluation Criteria	Total Weight	Docufree Corporation	Access Information Management	Databank IMX, LLC
----------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------

Cost Proposal	30	4.99	30	4.65
All Costs - Total boxed and non-boxed scanning, Microfiche, Destruction of copies, Software, and Services	30	4.99	30	4.65

As a result of the cost proposals received from the three choices, Access Information Management is the lead over the Docufree and Databank IMX, LLC. However, Access Information Management has placed a stipulation on the pricing, on page 8, in its response, it is stated that this is a fixed cost with a 10-year contract. It also states that all pricing is in U.S. dollars and will remain valid for sixty (60) days from the date of this proposal. The cost is based on the quantities provided in the cost table, which implies that it will take this company that length of time (10 years) to complete the scanning of the district’s existing records.

Decision Table

A decision table has been created showing total scores for each criterion. This table gives a complete view of all criteria used in evaluating each response.

Evaluation Criteria	Total Weight	Docufree Corporation	Access Information Management	Databank IMX, LLC
Ability to Execute	15	11.50	7.50	9.62
Service and Support	20	13.80	12.80	13.50
Technical Requirements	35	24.80	21.80	25.83
Cost Proposal	30	4.99	30	4.65
Total Points	100	55.09	72.1	53.6

Conclusion

After a careful evaluation and detailed team discussions, Docufree Corporation appears to be the best choice, even with the difference in cost proposals. In reviewing the results and evaluators' comments, and comparing evaluation results in totality, the team agreed that Docufree’s experience in K12, skillset, and overall response presentation was more far detailed and tailored to the requirements in the district’s proposal.