

LAKEWOOD BOARD OF EDUCATION

200 RAMSEY AVE

LAKEWOOD, NJ 08701

COMPETITIVE CONTRACT CC 02-2223

COMMITTEE EVALUATION REPORT

REVISED 7/8/22

Three responses were received for CC 02-2223 on June 30, 2022 @ 10:00 a.m. for Nonpublic School Instructional Services for Title I, III, IV and Chapter 192/193, opened publicly via live stream and were scored by an Evaluation Committee as follows. All supporting documentation is on file in the Business Office:

There are four instructional components of this Competitive Contract and each was scored separately.

TREE OF KNOWLEDGE											
192/193			TECHNICAL		MANAGEMENT		COST		TOTAL POINTS		
Line Item 0001											
			MAX 45 PTS		MAX 55 PTS		MAX 0 PTS				
SCORER 1			45		50						
SCORER 2			45		50						
SCORER 3			45		50						
		AVG	45		50		0		95	TOTAL 0001	
TITLE I			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS				
Line Item 0002											
SCORER 1			34		30						
SCORER 2			34		30						
SCORER 3			34		30						
		AVG	34		30		32.61		96.61	TOTAL 0002	
TITLE III			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS				
Line Item 0003											
SCORER 1			28		30						

SCORER 2			28		30						
SCORER 3			28		30						
		AVG	28		30		32.61		90.61	TOTAL 0003	
TITLE IV Line Item 0004			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS				
SCORER 1			34		30						
SCORER 2			34		30						
SCORER 3			34		30						
		AVG	34		30		32.61		96.61	TOTAL 0004	
							AVERAGE ALL SERVICES TOK			94.71 POINTS	
<u>TENDER</u> <u>TOUCH</u>											
192/193			TECHNICAL		MANAGEMENT		COST				
			MAX 45 PTS		MAX 55 PTS		MAX 0 PTS				
SCORER 1			45		55						
SCORER 2			45		55						
SCORER 3			45		55						
		AVG	45		55				100	TOTAL 0001	
TITLE I			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS				
SCORER 1			35		30						
SCORER 2			35		30						
SCORER 3			35		30						
		AVG	35		30		27.74		92.74	TOTAL 0002	
TITLE III			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS				
SCORER 1			35		30						
SCORER 2			35		30						
SCORER 3			35		30						
		AVG	35		30		27.74		92.74	TOTAL 0003	
TITLE IV			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS				
SCORER 1			35		30						

SCORER 2			35		30							
SCORER 3			35		30							
		AVG	35		30		27.74		92.74		TOTAL 0004	
							AVERAGE ALL SERVICES TENDER TOUCH				94.55 POINTS	
CATAPULT												
192/193			TECHNICAL		MANAGEMENT		COST					
			MAX 45 PTS		MAX 55 PTS		MAX 0 PTS					
SCORER 1			43.5		52							
SCORER 2			43.5		52							
SCORER 3			43.5		52							
		AVG	43.5		52				95.5		TOTAL 0001	
TITLE I			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS					
SCORER 1			33.5		29							
SCORER 2			33.5		29							
SCORER 3			33.5		29							
		AVG	33.5		29		29.51		92.01		TOTAL 0002	
TITLE III			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS					
SCORER 1			35		27							
SCORER 2			35		27							
SCORER 3			35		27							
		AVG	35		27		29.51		91.51		TOTAL 0003	
TITLE IV			MAX 35 PTS		MAX 30 PTS		MAX 35 PTS					
SCORER 1			33		30							
SCORER 2			33		30							
SCORER 3			33		30							
		AVG	33		\$30.00		\$29.51		92.51		TOTAL 0004	
							AVERAGE ALL SERVICES				92.89 POINTS	

The Cost Component for each Category is as follows. Each category was scored independently and then the average of all categories was used as the final point value for the cost component. This value together with the Technical and Management scores determined the total final score for each respondent.

<u>LINE ITEMS 0002, 0003 AND 0004</u>		<u>Catapult</u>	<u>Tender Touch</u>	<u>TOK</u>
<u>HOURLY RATES</u>				
MA CERTIFIED TEACHER		\$94.00	\$112.00	\$110.00
	PT VALUE	35	29.37	29.9
BA CERTIFIED TEACHER		\$88.00	\$96.00	\$100.00
	PT VALUE	35	32.08	30.8
PARA/SUB		\$67.18	\$90.00	\$70.00
	PT VALUE	35	26.12	33.59
LCSW, LPC, PSY.D., PH.D. PSYCHOLOGY		\$151.76	\$135.00	\$125.00
	PT VALUE	28.85	32.41	35
LSW/LAC		\$144.54	\$120.00	\$80.00
	PT VALUE	19.37	22.4	35
ESL TEACHER(TITLE III)		\$94.00	\$102.00	\$110.00
	PT VALUE	35	32.25	29.9
SPEECH & LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST		\$99.59	\$112.00	\$110.00
	PT VALUE	35	31.25	31.69
TITLE IV PRESENTATIONS (HR)		\$750.00	\$600.00	\$275.00
		12.83	16.04	35
	AVERAGE POINT VALUE FOR COST	29.51	27.74	32.61

All respondents were responsible and responsive to the specifications of this competitive contract.

NOTES:

Catapult listed a different hourly rate for Title I BA teacher in the body of their proposal but this was not requested on the proposal page. The District only requested one hourly rate in this category and

therefor the rate listed by Catapult on the proposal page of the specifications was the cost used throughout their response. Catapult did not delineate clearly what criteria they would be following and lost 1 point. They also lost .5 point for not showing evidence of using standardized test scores for determining eligibility in two separate instances. Catapult's proposal was missing one certification of their staff and lost 1 point and also lost 2 points for not providing evidence of an effective record keeping system. They lost a point for failing to list the allowable services to be provided under Title I. Under Title III they lost a total of 3 points for not provided the requisite number of ESL certifications. Lastly, Catapult lost 2 points in their explanation of Title IV presentations.

Tender Touch received perfect scores for both Technical and Management in all categories.

Tree of Knowledge lost 5 points for failing to affix a copy of NJDOE approvals for these services with their submission. They lost 1 point for omitting a portion of the requisite items under the counseling category and 5 points for failing to show evidence that services will be in compliance with eligibility criteria for Title III. They lost 3 points for not providing all supporting background documentation for their paraprofessionals.

TOK did not delineate the cost of a Speech Pathologist in their proposal. In a Nonpublic Consultation meeting it was determined that a Speech Pathologist could be used for ELA Instruction but it was not made clear that a cost for such should be provided. TOK explained that the cost would be the same as for a teacher with MA/MS degree. The omission of this cost on the original submission was not intentional and as such the district agreed to use this cost. As a result the scoring was revised as indicated in the above chart.

All three vendors are recommended for award by the Evaluation Committee.