Panel for Educational Policy
Contract Agenda
May 23, 2012

Item: 1 **Description:** Use of URL service, mylunchmoney.com, for parents to fund children's school meal accounts.

Term: 1 year **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Office of School Food **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
School-Link Technologies, Inc.	$95,100

Item: 2 **Description:** Recruit teachers to staff the City's most challenging public schools.

Term: 5 years **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Division of Human Resources **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Teach for America	$686,000

Item: 3 **Description:** Facility management services to the Division of School Facilities.

Term: 6 years **Options:** 2 two year options **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Division of School Facilities **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
ABM Janitorial Services - Northeast Inc	$14,107,114
Temco Services Industries Inc	$34,593,048

Item: 4 **Description:** Academic, youth development, and vocational support services for over-age and under-credited students to meet the requirements for graduation.

Term: 5 years **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Division of Academics, Performance and Support **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
BronxWorks, Inc.	$613,028
CAMBA	$614,671
East Side House	$614,414
Federation Employment & Guidance Service, Inc. (FEGS)	$2,767,158
Good Shepherd Services	$770,000
SCO Family of Services	$610,844

Item: 5 **Description:** Family workshops and school-based training to increase family involvement in children's education.

Term: 3 years **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Division of Family and Community Engagement **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Long Island University	$465,900

Item: 6 **Description:** Adobe software for everyday instructional and administrative use in classrooms and administrative offices.

Term: 3 years **Options:** None **Funding:** Reimbursable & Tax Levy

Division: Div. of Instructional & Information Technology **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
SHI International Corp	$1,000,000

Item: 7 **Description:** Amendment to extend bus insurance carrier and third party administrator.

Term: 2 years **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Office of Pupil Transportation **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Willis of New York, Inc.	$36,995,102

Item: 8 **Description:** Academic language development for teachers and administrators working with English language learners.

Term: 5 years **Options:** None **Funding:** Various

Division: Office of English Language Learners **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
West Ed	$450,000

Item: 9 **Description:** Off-site storage for vital computer back-up tapes consisting of data, e-mail, and other electronic media.

Term: 9 years 9 ½ months **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Div. of Instructional & Information Technology **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
GRM Information Management Services, Inc.	$85,000

Item: 1

Description:

Use of URL service, mylunchmoney.com, for parents to fund children's school meal accounts.

AMENDED REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO EXTEND URL SERVICE FOR EXISTING POS TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS FOR SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES

Annual/Total Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$95,100	Tax Levy	One Year	N/A	Negotiated Services	No	Requirements

Vendor Name & Address	School Link Technologies, Inc. 1437 6th Street Santa Monica, CA 90401-2410

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact
Lisa D'Amato Contract Manager Office of School Support Services	Linda Rodriguez Procurement Analyst

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to extend a contract with School Link Technologies, Inc. ("School Link") for the use of their Mylunchmoney.com Internet payment system for one year. The use of this URL is necessary for parents to continue to fund their children's school meal accounts with current point-of-sale (POS) technology also operated by School Link.

DISCUSSION

In December 2010, the Panel authorized an extension of contract with School Link for three years ending August 31, 2013 to maintain point-of-service (POS) technology software and to provide the corresponding Internet-based payment system Mylunchmoney.com (MLM) for two years ending August 31, 2012. This request is for an additional one-year extension for MLM to correspond to the end date of the POS system maintenance and software contract.

School Food originally intended to procure these services independently while a Request for Proposals (RFP) was completed for the expansion and completion of the POS system citywide. Instead, the RFP will also include the online prepayment system as part of the package because research revealed that no other online payment service can provide the necessary integration with the existing 363 School Link licenses. These details were not understood when the second extension was issued for MLM services.

The POS system automatically records student participation in the breakfast and lunch program, determining eligibility at the point of service for free, reduced-priced, and fully paid meals. The system also reduces cash handling on cafeteria lines by diverting cash payments to kiosks and to Mylunchmoney.com, an Internet-based payment system that School Link provides to manage household transactions for meal fee payments. Parents fund their children's meals by transferring funds electronically into their school meal accounts, thus providing a useful service to parents, students, and schools.

For the business to run efficiently, an automatic interface is essential. Changing providers mid-year would create operational issues in the field. The information needed for a customized automatic

integration with a third party vendor is proprietary to School Link. A loss of integration would impact the DOE negatively in a number of ways:

- There would be no real-time connection between the prepayment system and School Link system. Currently, parents can make a prepayment right before lunch and have that balance instantly available at the site. That would not be possible with a third party system as all data would have to be manually entered.
- Since information cannot be passed from the POS to the third party payment system, balances would no longer be available on the website. Parents would not know how much money their students have in an account at any given time.
- Low balance notifications would no longer be sent to parents.
- Recurring payments (automatic payment when a parent-established low-balance threshold is met) would no longer be available.
- Parents would not be able to go online and see what their students purchased.
- Parents would no longer be able to use the myLunchMoney.com livecall center, which provides data on both the payments website and the POS system; parents with questions would be directed to DOE staff.
- The complete reconciliation trail that School Link provides among bank statements, the web site deposit records, and School Link would no longer be available.
- The DOE would have to manually enter payments taken from the third party system into School Link, which will result in the need to hire individuals as well as the potential for data entry errors.

School Link has agreed to continue to charge the DOE at the original contracted rates of two percent. The average monthly fee is $2,000 based on average montly transactions of $100,000. School Link will continue to charge parents $1.00 per transaction. This fee is paid directly by the parents. Based on historical data we anticipate the extension to cost $95,100.

- Monthly Charge: $2,000 X 12 = $24,000
- Parent Transactions (not paid by DOE): $71,100 (annual average)

Since the original proposal was competitively solicited, and prices remain the same, prices are determined to be fair and reasonable.

A review of School Link's VENDEX, the Federal Debarment List, and Vendor Compliance Investigation Performance (VCIP) report revealed no significant adverse information. School Link has therefore been determined to be responsible.

Item: 2

Description:

Recruit teachers to staff the City's most challenging public schools.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION
FOR TEACH FOR AMERICA TO PROVIDE RECRUITING SERVICES

Estimated Annual / Total Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
Year 1: $630,000 Year 2: $1,020,000 Year 3: $1,180,000 Year 4: $480,000 Year 5: $120,000 Total: $3,430,000	Tax Levy	Five Years (9/1/12-8/31/17)	None	Negotiated Service	No	Requirements

Vendor Name & Address	Teach for America 519 8th Avenue, 15th Floor New York, NY 10018

Service Requestor / Contract Manager	Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact
Vicki Bernstein Executive Director Office of Teacher Recruitment & Quality	Marissa L. Procope Procurement Analyst

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to contract with Teach for America (TFA) to recruit outstanding recent college graduates who will commit to staffing the City's most challenging public schools.

DISCUSSION

TFA enlists individuals who demonstrate leadership, dedication, and achievement through a rigorous selection process, including an application essay and a day-long interview. Research has shown that the personal attributes are closely related to candidates' success as teachers. Last spring, approximately 48,000 individuals applied for 5,200 available positions nationwide.

Under New York State regulations, TFA teachers must earn Transitional B certificates to teach in the City's public schools. To obtain certification, corps members are required to complete an accredited university's Master's degree program in education. Since Transitional B regulations first applied to TFA teachers in the fall of 2001, the DOE has subsidized the university component of the program.

Over the last 16 years, TFA has placed teachers ("corps members") in New York City's hardest-to-staff schools. Without corps members, these schools would be severely understaffed. In school year 2010-11, approximately 135 corps members were placed in Bronx and Brooklyn schools; TFA expects to place another 180 corps members in these challenging schools for the fall of 2012. The contract has an estimated cost of $3,430,000, based on the previous year's average cost per participant.

The DOE subsidizes tuition and operating costs for the program. Tuition rates are estimated at $14,000 per degree and operating costs for recruitment, selection, training, and support exceeds $40,000 per corps member. The DOE contributes a tuition subsidy of $2,000 and $4,500 towards operating costs per member. TFA has identified private sources to cover 85% of the revenue required. Based on the information provided, TFA's pricing has been determined to be fair and reasonable.

These services were not procured competitively because TFA offers an attractive and cost-effective program that meets all of the DOE's needs. Moreover, independent research has shown a direct relationship between the services provided by TFA-recruited corps members and student success.

On May 17, 2012 the Committee on Contracts approved this contract.

A comprehensive background check was completed on TFA and adverse findings were identified, including disallowed charges by the Unites States Department of Education (USDOE). The USDOE was repaid. Notwithstanding this incident, TFA has performed well for the DOE on this work in the past and so is regarded as responsible.

Item: 3

Description:

Facility management services to the Division of School Facilities.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION
RFP R0897 - FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR DSF

Estimated Annual / Total Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Estimated Options Amount	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$ 48,700,162 / $292,200,972	Tax Levy	Six Years	Two Additional 2-Year Periods	$194,800,648	Request for Proposals (RFP)	No	Requirement

Vendor Name and Address	Estimated Annual Amount	Estimated Total Amount
Temco Service Industries One Park Avenue New York, NY 10016	$34,593,048	$207,558,288
ABM Janitorial Services-Northeast, Inc. 321 West 44th Street, Room 701 New York, NY 10036	$14,107,114	$84,642,684

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact
John O'Connell Executive Director Division of School Facilities (DSF)	Shelley Epstein Director

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to contract with Temco Service Industries and ABM Janitorial Services to provide Facility Management Services (FMS) at the direction of the Division of School Facilities (DSF). The contract term is six years with two 2-year optional renewal periods. The contract provides for annual Prevailing Wage and Consumer Price Index adjustments.

DISCUSSION

The DSF is responsible for the repair, maintenance, and operation (RMO) of more than 1,200 sites/buildings, each of which has a custodian or building manager who oversees the operations and maintenance of the physical plant. There are two options to provide these services: civil service Custodial Engineers (CEs) and independent FMS contractors. The FMS contracts include services that are not included among the CEs' responsibilities. The following are examples of such services:

- FMS contractors paint 25 percent of the building annually (including ceilings), whereas the CEs paint 17 to 18 percent and only to a height of 10 feet (wall surfaces).
- FMS contractors are responsible for maintenance repairs in which the cost of the labor and materials is $1,000 or less per individual job and for mechanical/electrical equipment and plumbing system repairs in which the cost of the labor, materials, and equipment is $ 2,000 or less per occurrence. They also pay the first $1K or $2K if the cost exceeds the threshold or if DOE performs the work.
- Service contracts for elevators, boilers, central A/C, interior fire alarms, fire extinguishers, and other equipment are included in their services.

- Access to buildings on Saturday for four hours and extended hours Monday through Friday are provided at no additional cost.
- Grievances and arbitrations costs are not passed on to the DOE, whereas CEs receive additional funding from the DOE for those legal cases.

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued because the services vary qualitatively and, therefore, cannot be effectively evaluated and compared on bid prices alone. The RFP included five Aggregate Classes as follows: Aggregate Class 1-Bronx (26 schools), Aggregate Class 2-Queens (10 schools), Aggregate Class 3-Manhattan (16 schools), Aggregate Class 4-North Brooklyn (42 schools), and Aggregate Class 5-South Brooklyn / Staten Island (15 schools). Prior to submitting proposals, and under the supervision of DOE managers, all vendors were given the opportunity to physically visit a group of schools currently under the FMS program.

Seven proposals were received for Aggregate Classes 1-3 and six proposals were received for Aggregate Classes 4 and 5. A committee consisting of DSF's Director of Finance, a Borough Contract Manager, a Borough Maintenance Planner, and two Directors of Facilities evaluated the proposals.

Based on initial proposals, the committee narrowed the field to five proposals (Temco Service Industries, ABM Janitorial, Aramark, Southeast Service, and GCA Services Group) that best met the requirements of the RFP and provided reasonable prices. These proposers were invited for oral presentations and to address questions from the committee.

The committee ultimately recommended Temco for award in Aggregate Classes 1, 3, and 4. Temco provided the lowest cost in these areas and their proposal provided a detailed program plan showing clear descriptions of how they would approach the janitorial and mechanical/engineering work. They have the necessary technical expertise, organizational capacity, and years of experience working in schools. Temco has provided satisfactory service to the DOE on previous contracts and DSF is confident they will continue to provide satisfactory service.

The committee recommended ABM for award in Aggregate Classes 2 and 5. ABM provided the lowest pricing in these areas and their proposal provided a detailed program plan including cost savings methods such as focusing on energy management, eliminating redundancies in top positions, and re-training and cross-training staff. It was determined they have the organizational capacity and experience to service the two areas.

The Vendor Research and Price Analysis Unit (VRPA) conducted a comprehensive background check on Temco and found the following noteworthy information:

- A 2011 investigation by the Special Commissioner of Investigation for the NYC School District (SCI) substantiated that three employees of Temco allowed individuals to enter a school building and use the gymnasium during the overnight hours. The DOE, Temco, and the union agreed on appropriate disciplinary actions for the employees and the DOE received a satisfactory corrective action plan from Temco.
- In 2006, the SCI found that at least 3 Temco employees assigned to DOE schools were directed instead to work on home improvement projects at the residences of Temco executives. On these occasions, other Temco personnel assigned to the school and possessing the requisite licenses remained on site. Due to the manner in which the DOE was billed under the contract, the DOE was not over-billed as a result of this conduct.
- There have been four cross-claims by the City against Temco in which students who slipped and fell sued the City. None of the court cases involved any egregious act on Temco's part and the matters were handled in accord with Temco's contract.

In light of Temco's prior history of satisfactory performance on DOE work and the size of the vendor, who employs 3,085 personnel in the Tri-State area and generates worldwide revenues in excess of

$338 million, the DOE believes that none of these matters precludes a determination that Temco is a responsible vendor.

VRPA's comprehensive background check on ABM identified the following information as noteworthy:

- The DOE found several media reports citing, discrimination, immigration, and other matters with the most noteworthy being the rape, in 2006, of a student in Scottsdale, AZ, by an ABM worker who was an illegal alien with a criminal record. Although the Scottsdale school district reduced the number of schools serviced by ABM, it has confirmed that ABM continues to provide contracted services. ABM has indicated that it has instituted new steps in its hiring process to prevent future incidents, including an improved background check process.
- A 2011 allegation of discrimination against Latino janitors in California was settled for $180,000 without ABM Industries (parent of the prime vendor) admitting fault. An allegation of sexual harassment of 21 female janitors, including allegations of sexual assault, resulted in a payment of $5.8 million to the plaintiffs in 2010. In Washington State, a female employee won a gender-discrimination lawsuit against ABM's parent company, ABM Industries, and ultimately collected $5 million in 2010, after appeal. ABM has informed the DOE that it has a zero-tolerance sexual harassment policy that includes the training of supervisors and a toll-free hotline. ABM has provided an attestation that any individuals accused of sexual harassment still working for ABM will not work on DOE business.

In light of the size and nature of ABM's businesses, which include 64,550 employees working on 35,000 contracts with $2.38 billion in revenue, the DOE does not consider these incidents significant enough to preclude a contract award. As such, ABM has been determined to be responsible.

A review of the financial statements for both Temco and ABM did not reveal any risk associated with doing business with these vendors.

On average, pricing on this contract (based on cost per square foot) is 0.2 percent higher than the cost of the work being done by Custodian Engineers and six percent less overall than the current FMS contract for 82 schools. Most importantly, the additional services covered under these contracts suggest that this model is actually 0.28 percent lower in overall costs than the CE model. The receipt of several proposals has ensured a competitive process.

Exact comparisons between in-house costs and contractual costs cannot be made as services and cost structures are different. For example, in-house estimates excludes pension costs, which are a City expense not included in the DOE budget, as well as potential retroactive, collectively bargained wages owed to certain in-house employees.

A price cost analysis conducted by VRPA determined that there were multiple bidders for each class, awards were made to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder in each class who could demonstrate capacity to provide the required services, and that the price per square foot for four of the five aggregate classes is below the price the DOE currently pays. Pricing has therefore been determined to be fair and reasonable.

R0897 – FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SERVICES: BID LIST

AGGREGATE CLASS 1 - BRONX		
Contractor Name	**Annual Contract Value**	**BAFO Received**
Temco Service Industries	**$ 12,374,724**	**$ 12,352,224**
ABM Janitorial Services	$ 12,909,608	$ 12,852,653
Aramark Management Services	$ 13,885,640	
Guardian Industrial Services	$ 14,491,364	
Pritchard Industries Inc	$ 15,039,367	
Urban Building Maintenance	$ 15,212,512	
GCA Services Group	$ 18,164,133	

AGGREGATE CLASS 2 - QUEENS		
Contractor Name	**Annual Contract Value**	**BAFO Received**
ABM Janitorial Services	**$ 6,096,932**	**$ 6,069,800**
Aramark Management Services	$ 6,326,031	
SSC Service Solutions	$ 6,401,076	
Temco Service Industries	$ 6,470,492	$ 6,354,756
Guardian Industrial Services	$ 7,260,489	
Pritchard Industries Inc	$ 8,345,705	
GCA Services Group	$ 9,068,331	

AGGREGATE CLASS 3 - MANHATTAN		
Contractor Name	**Annual Contract Value**	**BAFO Received**
Temco Service Industries	**$ 5,808,936**	
Urban Building Maintenance	$ 6,296,654	
ABM Janitorial Services	$ 6,431,331	$ 6,402,472
Guardian Industrial Services	$ 6,475,705	
Aramark Management Services	$ 7,105,544	
Pritchard Industries Inc	$ 7,506,738	
GCA Services Group	$ 8,473,671	

AGGREGATE CLASS 4 - BROOKLYN		
Contractor Name	**Annual Contract Value**	**BAFO Received**
Temco Service Industries	**$ 16,431,888**	
ABM Janitorial Services	$ 17,152,042	$ 17,076,218
Guardian Industrial Services	$ 18,760,789	
Aramark Management Services	$ 18,911,587	
Pritchard Industries Inc	$ 21,207,206	
GCA Services Group	$ 23,567,147	

AGGREGATE CLASS 5 – BROOKLYN/RICHMOND		
Contractor Name	**Annual Contract Value**	**BAFO Received**
ABM Janitorial Services	**$ 8,397,191**	**$ 8,037,314**
Temco Service Industries	$ 8,744,232	$ 8,365,752
Aramark Management Services	$ 9,024,741	$ 8,930,786
Guardian Industrial Services	$ 10,187,390	
Pritchard Industries Inc	$ 10,802,105	
GCA Services Group	$ 12,735,542	

Note: Prices reduced in Aggregate Class 5 are due to the cancellation of one school (K884). Total number of schools is 108.

Item: 4

Description:

Academic, youth development, and vocational support services for over-age and under-credited students to meet the requirements for graduation.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO PROVIDE LEARNING-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG ADULT BOROUGH CENTERS AND TRANSFER SCHOOLS - R0931

Annual/Total Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$5,990,115 / $29,950,575	Tax Levy	Five Years	None	Request for Proposals (RFP)	No	Full Value

Vendor Name & Address	Vendors listed below.

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact
Tom Pendleton Office of Postsecondary Readiness (OPSR)	Begum Gonul Division of Contracts and Purchasing

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to contract with the vendors listed below for academic, youth development, and vocational support for over-age and under-credited students to meet the requirements for graduation. This authorization will result in multiple fixed-price contracts. All of the contracts will be active for approximately five years, commencing on or around July 1, 2012 and terminating on or around June 30, 2017. These contracts will replace the current contracts set to expire June 30, 2012. In addition, contracts for one new Learning to Work Transfer School site and one new Young Adult Borough Center site have been awarded.

DISCUSSION

These contracts are intended to continue Learning-to-Work programs in compliance with a Mayoral Initiative announced in 2005. The primary goals of the Learning-to-Work Program are to provide a range of academic and youth development support services to over-age, under-credited students that enhance academic performance and outcomes, while assisting in the development of work-readiness skills and planning for post-secondary careers and college. These students will also learn how to use their educational, internship, and/or employment activities as building blocks for achieving long-term goals.

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued on March 1, 2012 and was advertised in the City Record and on the DOE web site. Various professional development, career training, and student counseling service providers on the DOE bidders list were also notified via e-mail. Seventeen proposals were received.

The RFP was divided into two components: (1) Learning to Work for Young Adult Borough Centers, and (2) Learning to Work for Transfer Schools. Vendors were able to propose for either or both components and multiple locations, and were instructed to indicate the specific sites where they would provide services for existing and new programs. As in previous years, vendors were informed that the location of the transfer school would be identified by the time the contracts were finalized; however, at the time of the pre-proposal conference, the location of the new YABC, Boys and Girls High School in Brooklyn, was announced.

Proposals were evaluated by an eight-member committee drawn from the Office of Youth and Community Development and different units within the Office of Postsecondary Readiness, including

Multiple Pathways, Career and Technical Education, and Connected Foundations. All committee members have experience working with community-based organizations that have contracts with the DOE to provide services to schools, programs, and students. Proposals were scored using the following evaluation criteria: program plan (25 points), organizational capacity (25 points), qualifications and experience (25 points) and price (25 points).

Of the 17 organizations that submitted proposals, two failed to demonstrate that they met the minimum requirements of at least three years of experience providing the specific type of services. The third vendor selected only a potential new site in a borough that was later not approved for a new site. All three vendors were notified that their proposals would not be evaluated and no protest was received. Following the evaluation process, seven proposals by six vendors were recommended for award. Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc. (FEGS), based on their demonstrated achievement of the defined outcomes, a robust program of services and work plan, and proven capacity to manage the sites indicated in their proposal, was awarded four sites. The new YABC site was awarded to Good Shepherd Services and the new Transfer School site was awarded to East Side House because the evaluation committee determined that these organizations can best serve in these sites since both have histories of providing similar LTW services in those geographic locations.

The number of recommended awards and total responses in each component are:

Component	1	2
No. of Proposals Received	6	12
No. of Proposals Awarded	2	5

A request for proposals was the preferred procurement method because the services require vendors who have experience in assisting this student population, linkages with social service organizations, and partnerships with employers who can place these students for internships.

These services are contracted out because the Learning-to–Work model requires partnerships with organizations providing youth development and support for re-engaging students and families, while offering greater access to community-based services.

The Vendor Research and Price Analysis (VRPA) unit conducted background checks for FEGS, whose self-reported cautions on VENDEX included:

- Failure to submit timely financial statements to the New York State Education Department. To resolve the allegation, FEGS agreed to pay a fine without admitting wrongdoing.
- A subpoena issued to FEGS by the Office of the Inspector General regarding records related to an independent contractor. FEGS claims they were not involved in the matter and was simply the repository of the documents subpoenaed.
- A fine in the amount of $1,000 issued by the NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene for failure to comply with certain administrative requirements relating to summer day camp activities. FEGS currently holds a valid permit to operate a day camp in NYC, in compliance with City licensing requirements.

VRPA determined that the above findings are not significant enough to preclude an award because they have been adequately addressed and determined FEGS to be responsible. Additional background check information is currently being reviewed, and should other significant adverse information be found the Request for Authorization will be revised.

Good Shepherd received an overall unsatisfactory performance rating from the Department of Youth and Community Development in 2007. However, Good Shepherd has performed satisfactorily in providing services under prior contracts. Another caution revealed that advocate counselors for Good Shepherd intentionally submitted falsified records to a DOE school, but all those involved in the matter were terminated and Good Shepherd reimbursed the DOE.

Background checks were completed for all other vendors and no significant adverse information was identified. Therefore, the vendors have been determined to be responsible.

	INITIAL PRICING		BAFO PRICING	
Vendor	Component 1	Component 2	Component 1	Component 2
BronxWorks	$ -	**$750,700**	$ -	**$613,028**
CAMBA, Inc.	$ -	**$622, 671**	$ -	**$614,671**
Early Intervention, LLC	$ -	$4,572,330	$ -	$ -
East Side House, Inc.	$ -	**$749,598**	$ -	**$614,414**
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc. (FEGS)	**$818,067**	**$725,163**	**$770,590**	**$612,989**
Good Shepherd Services	**$795,904**	$ -	**$770,000**	**$ -**
Henkels&McCoy	$781,245	$ -	$ -	$ -
NYC Mission Society	$ -	$589,466	$ -	$ -
Phipps Community Development	$ -	$690,683	$ -	$ -
Research Foundation of the City University of New York	$781,779	$708,290	$ -	$ -
SCO Family of Services	$ -	**$672,883**	$ -	**$610,844**
South Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation (SoBRO)	$ -	$589,368	$ -	$ -
St. John's University	$ -	$538,279	$ -	$ -
Tree of Knowledge	$767,250	$712,440	$ -	$ -

After negotiations, the total annual amount for both the YABCs and Transfer Schools programs was reduced to $5,990,115, resulting in a cost savings of approximately 10 percent. Pricing is on average lower than previous contracts for the same services. Pricing has therefore been determined to be fair and reasonable.

VENDOR	COMPONENT(S)	LOCATION
BronxWorks	2	Jill Chaifetz HS
CAMBA, Inc.	2	Liberation Diploma Plus HS
East Side House	2	Mott Haven Community HS
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc. (FEGS)	1	▪ Kennedy HS YABC ▪ South Shore HS YABC
	2	▪ Bronx Community HS ▪ Brooklyn Bridge Academy HS
Good Shepherd Services	1	Boys and Girls HS YABC
SCO Family of Services	2	North Queens Community HS

Item: 5

Description:

Family workshops and school-based training to increase family involvement in children's education.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO PROVIDE FAMILY WORKSHOPS AND SCHOOL-BASED TRAINING - R0919

Estimated Annual / Total Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
Year 1: $465,900 Year 2: $458,865 Year 3: $446,730 Total: $1,371,495	Tax Levy	Three Years	None	Request for Proposals (RFP)	No	Requirements

Vendor Name & Address	Long Island University 700 Northern Boulevard Greenvale, NY 11548

Service Requestor / Contract Manager	Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact
Lashanta Baptiste Division of Family & Community Engagement (FACE)	Begum Gonul Central Office Procurement

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to contract with Long Island University (LIU) to provide family workshops and school-based training to increase family involvement in children's education. The contract term will be three years, commencing on or about July 1, 2012, with no options to extend or renew.

DISCUSSION

In 2002, pursuant to the Chancellor's Children First agenda, the DOE established a parent support system, including placement of full-time parent coordinators in more than 1,600 schools. The parent support system gives families and communities the access, information, and tools needed to be full partners in the education of the City's public school children. This mandate is based on research that supports the premise that students with involved parents, regardless of their background or income, are more likely to succeed in school than their peers whose parents are not so involved. In January 2011, the DOE piloted five Partnership Standards for Schools and Families (Partnership Standards) in a sample of 15 schools, both traditional district and charter, and of all levels and sizes citywide.

To continue to build the parent support system, the Division of Family & Community Engagement (FACE) sought a vendor to provide workshops for families and training for school communities and networks. The RFP was advertised in the City Record and on the DOE web site. Various professional development, academic intervention, and parent training service providers on the DOE bidders list were also notified via e-mail. Nine proposals were received.

Vendors were asked to submit proposals for one or both of the RFP's two components. For Component 1 – School-based Community Training, vendors were asked to submit proposals for developing a comprehensive training curriculum for the implementation of Partnership Standards. This curriculum will take the form of school-based workshops for school communities and online train-the-trainer school-based workshops for school leadership teams. For Component 2 – Borough-wide Family Workshops, vendors were asked to submit proposals for developing resources for families through a minimum of three workshops per borough per year. These will serve at least 2,000 families annually.

Proposals were evaluated by a three-member committee that included representatives from the Office of Student Enrollment, Office of Postsecondary Readiness, and the Chancellor's Parent Advisory

Council (CPAC). FACE provided advisory support to the voting committee. Proposals were evaluated based on the following criteria: program plan, organizational capacity, demonstrated effectiveness, and price, with each criterion weighted at 25 percent.

While seven proposers were invited for oral presentations the selection committee felt that only proposals from the Children's Aid Society (CAS) and Long Island University (LIU) presented comprehensive plans that met program requirements and were priced competitively.

Ultimately the committee found that LIU provided a more comprehensive program evaluation plan that included rigorous statistical analysis. The committee also found that LIU's plan to create an advisory group, which will include parents and professionals, strengthened the quality of workshop materials. LIU's plan to organize the train-the-trainer materials, for which the DOE will own the intellectual property rights, into toolkits was also a strong aspect of their program design. LIU's project leaders possess experience in both general education and special education. Moreover, LIU proposed the lowest price for Component 1 and competitive pricing for Component 2.

PRICING

	INITIAL PRICING		BAFO PRICING	
Vendor	**Component 1**	**Component 2**	**Component 1**	**Component 2**
Computer for Youth Foundation, Inc.	$2,418,095	$2,783,133	$ -	$ -
Learning Leaders, Inc	$1,107,240	$517,255	$ -	$ -
Long Island University	**$716,670**	**$654,825**	**$716,670**	**$654,825**
Resources for Children with Special Needs, Inc.	$ -	$84,500	$ -	$ -
RMC Research Corporation	$2,028,795	$3,913,167	$ -	$ -
SmartStart Education, LLC	$1,004,670	$1,305,562	$ -	$ -
The Children's Aid Society	$1,200,000	$900,000	$1,200,000	$900,000
The New York Urban League, Inc.	$ -	$560,115	$ -	$ -
Universal Companies	$1,313,190	$619,380	$ -	$ -

FACE estimated 30 workshops for Component 1 and 15 workshops for Component 2 as the ideal range for the evaluation of pricing. LIU offered an average workshop price of $7,963 for Component 1 and $14,551 for Component 2 over the term of the contract. Pricing includes labor, material, and general expenses at minimum. LIU's overall pricing was compared to prior contract amounts and to contracts offering similar services and was found to be lower. Therefore, LIU's prices have been determined to be fair and reasonable.

We have reviewed VENDEX, federal debarment and our own files. No adverse information was found. A more comprehensive background check is currently in progress, and should significant adverse information be found the Request for Authorization will be revised.

An RFP was the preferred method of procurement because the award process required that vendors be evaluated on a number of qualitative criteria, including a demonstrated record of building sustainable capacity in large numbers of schools.

These services are being contracted because the DOE does not have the necessary personnel or resources to perform them.

Item: 6

Description:

Adobe software for everyday instructional and administrative use in classrooms and administrative offices.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE ADOBE SOFTWARE PROGRAMS

Estimated Annual / Total Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$1,000,000 / $3,000,000	Reimbursable / Tax Levy	Three Years	None	Request for Bids (RFB)	No	Requirements

Vendor Name & Address	Software House International Corp. 33 Knightsbridge Road Piscataway, NJ 08854

Service Requestor / Contract Manager	Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact
James McBride Division of Contracts and Purchasing	Domion Pontrelli

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to contract with Software House International Corp. (SHI) for Adobe software products through a Contractual Licensing Program (CLP). The three-year term will begin on or about June 1, 2012.

DISCUSSION

SHI will supply and deliver Adobe software for everyday instructional and administrative use in the classroom and administrative offices.

Adobe is the leading software media tool company with over 43 percent of the creative market, according to Forbes and Bloomberg. DOE is a long-standing user of Adobe products in both the classroom and in business operations. The most used software is their Acrobat Reader, which is free and is already pre-installed on over 200,000 DOE computers. This is a DOE standard and has been for over six years. In addition, Adobe offers a creative suite and various enterprise tools that are used for business process and document management purposes in DOE business offices (e.g., PhotoShop for video editing, Dreamweaver for web development, Captivate for creating e-learning content).

A Request for Bids (RFB) was released to all vendors on the DOE's software bidders list, advertised in the City Record, and posted on the DOE website. The RFB requested pricing for the Adobe products most frequently purchased over the previous two fiscal years and was based on a market basket approach. Four bids were received. SHI was the low bidder, offering a range of a five to 20 percent discount off list price, depending on the item. As such, the pricing has been determined to be fair and reasonable. The estimated contract amount is based on prior years' usage.

VENDOR	MARKET BASKET BID
Software House International (SHI)	**$93,136**
Logisoft Computer Products	$93,632
CDW Government LLC	$99,958
Diamond Power Consultant Group	$134,236

DCP has reviewed the SHI's background in VENDEX, the Vendor CIP Report, and EPLS – Fed Debar List. No significant adverse information was revealed. The vendor has therefore been determined to be responsible.

Item: 7

Description:

Amendment to extend bus insurance carrier and third party administrator.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO AMEND CONTRACT WITH WILLIS OF NY, INC. TO EXTEND INSURANCE CARRIER AND THIRD PARTY ADMINISTRATOR

Vendor Name & Address	Estimated Annual Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive	Contract Type
Willis of New York, Inc. One World Financial Center/200 Liberty Street New York, NY 10285		Tax Levy	6/30/11-6/30/16	Three 1-year renewal options	Request for Proposals (RFP)	No	Requirements
Insurance Carrier (2 years) Greenwich Insurance Co. Seaview House 70 Seaview Avenue Stamford, CT 06902 **Total 2 years**	FY '13 Estimated Annual Premium: $730,250 FY '14 Estimated Annual Premium: $780,250 Estimated Annual Cash Collateral Payments: $35,000,000 (Includes $20 million upfront) Total Annual: FY '13: $35,730,250 FY '14: $35,780,250 **$71,510,500**						
Third Party Administrator (TPA): (2 years) Sedgwick Claims Management Services, Inc. 2 Landmark Square – Suite 211 Stamford, CT 06901 **Total 2 years**	FY '13 and '14: Estimated $ $1,214,852 **$2,429,704**						

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts & Purchasing
Eric Goldstein Chief Executive Officer Office of School Support Services	Sande Pisik Procurement Analyst Division of Contracts & Purchasing

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to amend the above referenced contract with Willis of NY, Inc. which provides insurance brokerage services to the DOE pursuant to a five year contract which began June 30, 2011. This amendment will extend the previously approved insurance carrier and Third Party Administrator (TPA) contracts for an additional two year period. The previous Request for Authorization listed XL Reinsurance America, Inc. as the insurance carrier. They are the parent company of Greenwich Insurance Co., the actual insurance carrier. Sedgwick

Claims Management Services, Inc. will remain as the TPA. There will be a modest increase of $50,000 in FY'14 for the premium for Greenwich.

DISCUSSION

A managed competitive solicitation process has been conducted twice by Willis within the past 10 months. The selection of XL/Greenwich as insurance carrier was based on their offering the lowest pricing of all the proposals received. Willis has again gone back to the marketplace and was advised that those companies that had previously declined still weren't interested and those that quoted were not going to improve their offering. Accordingly, Willis recommends that the Department extend the current contract.

Greenwich will hold the cost of their premium for FY '13 and increase FY'14 by $50,000, a 3.8% increase over the two year renewal period. Willis reports this is in line with industry norms where over 26% of policy renewals were increased at least 5% and only 13% of rates were held. Ninety seven percent (97%) of the Greenwich premium represents payment for losses incurred under the program. Willis has validated the expected loss estimate with a third party actuary who has previously worked with the DOE data and their estimates are in line with Greenwich's. If losses do not materialize, the remaining funds will be returned to the Department.

Sedgwick was initially selected as the TPA, although their flat rate was 3% higher than the incumbent Gallagher Bassett. Their expertise in working with urban bus companies was viewed as an advantage that would lead to reduced costs. It is premature to evaluate their effectiveness at this time because claims can take up to 7 years to be resolved. Willis recommends an extension of Sedgwick's contract to provide them time and opportunity to reduce costs.

The competitive nature of the original procurement process proved both vendors to be qualified, and to have fair and reasonable pricing. At that time, both Sedgwick and Greenwich submitted VENDEX forms and a background check was conducted by DCP's Vendor Research and Price Analysis Unit. Sedgewick was determined to be responsible based on no adverse findings.

A background check had not been completed at the time of the prior Request for Authorization (RA). Since then, the following noteworthy information was reported by Greenwich Insurance Co. in its VENDEX:

- Market conduct examinations in NV, MA, and CA for which Greenwich was assessed penalties of $3,050, $3,079, and $110,000 respectively.
- Multiple claims compliance audits in CO, ME, KY, TX, & ME resulting in recommendations for improvement or fines ranging from $700 to $35,000, except for one fine of $84,475. These audits were primarily of XL Specialty Insurance, but also included Greenwich on three occasions.
- A $2,500 fine issued to Greenwich for failure to file required reports on time in WA.
- A Maine complaint investigation regarding XL Specialty Insurance resulting in an order to pay $100.

The DOE does not consider the issues above to impact the responsibility determination as Greenwich continues to do business in every state mentioned above. Further, in light of the heavily regulated nature of the insurance industry and Greenwich's volume of business, which includes work valued at $139 million in all 50 states and more than $2 billion for the parent XL Reinsurance America, the DOE believes the numbers and nature of the matters cited above are not unusual. Moreover, while some matters may be pending, we are confident that based on its

past performance in addressing regulatory findings, that Greenwich and its affiliate XL Specialty Insurance will respond and resolve these matters in a an appropriate and timely manner. Therefore, the DOE determined this vendor to be responsible.

Item: 8

Description:

Academic language development for teachers and administrators working with English language learners.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (MTAC#1C617) RA #4

Estimated Annual / Total Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$450,000 / $2,250,000	Various, including Tax Levy & Reimbursable Funds	Five Years	None	Multiple Task Award Contract (MTAC)	No	Requirements

Vendor Name & Address	Awarded Component(s)
WestEd 730 Harrison Street San Francisco, CA 94107-1242	1, 3, 4

Service Requestor / Contract Manager	Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact
Angelica Infante Executive Director, Office of English Language Learners Division of Students with Disabilities & ELLs	Joy Gentolia Director, Instructional Service Procurement

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to contract with WestEd to provide professional development services for teachers and administrators working with English Language Learners in the development of skills in language appropriate to the classroom context. These services will be provided at the discretion of each participating school.

DISCUSSION

This is the fourth request for authorization (RA) for comprehensive professional development services for ELL programs.

Vendors were asked submit proposals for one or more of the following components:

- Component 1 - Professional development services in Spanish
- Component 2 - Professional development services in one or more languages such as Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Haitian Creole, Korean, Russian, or Urdu
- Component 3 - Professional development services in academic language development
- Component 4 - Professional development services in mathematics, science, social studies, English, and/or foreign language instruction

An evaluation committee consisting of three former teachers who are now school administrators within the Office of English Language Learners was established to ensure that the selected vendor will meet schools' needs. Proposals were scored based on: program plan (25 points), demonstrated effectiveness (25 points), organizational capacity (25 points), and price (25 points).

There are currently five contracts for these services under the three previous RAs.

WestEd's professional development workshops are designed to build the capacity of K-12 dual language program teachers, administrators, and professional development leaders to improve English

and Spanish literacy and oral skills in students. Through their Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL) program, school staff is instructed in accelerating the development of literacy and the use of language appropriate to the classroom context for minority students and other underserved student populations.

The QTEL program supports ELL in content area instruction in secondary mathematics, English, language arts, social studies, ESL, science, and Spanish native language arts with a focus on the common core state standards. It provides learning methods and strategies in Spanish that will transfer into improved academic performance in English. The core package of services includes: classroom observations, walk-throughs with site administrators and instructional leaders, assessments, in-classroom modeling, audio/video recording, study guides, modules, and ongoing support.

WestEd's workshop sessions last six hours, accommodate a maximum of 40 participants, and have an average rate of $1,659 per hour. The rates of vendors currently contracted by the DOE for similar MTACs range from $1,075 to $3,371. WestEd's proposed hourly rates for ELL PD are on average seven percent higher than their 2007 contracted rates, an increase that aligns with the CPI index. Because WestEd's pricing falls within the competitive range of vendors offering similar programs, their pricing has been determined to be fair and reasonable.

The estimated annual contract amount for WestEd is based on the average of previous expenditures.

Background checks included VENDEX, the Federal Excluded Parties List, the Uniform Commercial Code Lien Search, Vendor Watch List, and a comprehensive background check by the VRPA unit. No adverse information was uncovered. Thus the vendor has been determined to be responsible.

Contracts for these services are necessary because the DOE does not possess the personnel required to provide them.

The MTAC process is the preferred procurement method as this process allows the DOE to award contracts for similar services to multiple vendors in order to meet demand for such services and to offer a choice among vendors.

As a part of the MTAC process, all service requests over $25,000 must go through a competitive process for procurement of services. Users will be required to create a scope of services and conduct a mini-solicitation process among the awarded vendors in their component areas. Vendors will be required to provide a statement of work and pricing based on their contracted services, which will be evaluated and scored by the user. Upon completion of this mini-solicitation process, schools will be able to secure services via a purchase order. This process is to ensure competition among the large number of vendors who have been awarded contracts as a result of this procurement. Future RAs for these services will be submitted in batches as new providers are presented for award of contracts.

Item: 9

Description:

Off-site storage for vital computer back-up tapes consisting of data, e-mail, and other electronic media.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO USE DCAS OFF-SITE RECORDS STORAGE AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES CONTRACT

Annual/Total Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Options	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$85,000 / $850,000	Tax Levy	7/1/12 – 4/15/22 (9 Years, 9½ Months)	None	Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS) Citywide Contract	No	Requirements

Vendor Name & Address	GRM Information Management Services 215 Coles Street Jersey City, NJ 07310

Service Requestor / Contract Manager	Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact
Johel Placencia Director of Server Operations / Enterprise Email Services Division of Instructional and Information Technology (DIIT)	James McBride Chief Administrator Division of Contracts and Purchasing (DCP)

PURPOSE

Authorization is requested to use DCAS's Off-Site Records Storage and Associated Services contract. This is a multi-year contract that was procured by DCAS and that fully supports DOE's needs. The annual usage is estimated to be $85,000 based on historical spending.

DISCUSSION

DOE has approximately 27,500 tapes, which contain copies of data, e-mail, and other electronic media that users deem important and/or that may be legally required to be archived. These tapes are stored at an off-site facility to ensure the information is retrievable in the event of a catastrophic failure at DOE's main operation site at 2 MetroTech. DOE lacks the space, staff, and expertise to store computer back-up tapes on-site with the appropriate level of security.

DCAS prepared a Request for Bids, soliciting a vendor to provide off-site records storage and associated services for City agencies. All agencies of the City and DOE would be authorized to use the resulting contract, which was awarded to GRM.

GRM currently has a contract with DOE to provide similar services, which is set to expire on June 30, 2012. Under that contract, GRM has provided satisfactory services to DOE since 2006. The services under the new contract meet all of DOE's requirements. Moreover, because GRM is already working with the DOE, there is no need to incur the expense of transferring tapes to a new facility.

The discounts under DCAS's Off-Site Records Storage contract were negotiated under the assumption that the DOE would also be using the contract. Storage pricing per item under the new contract is less than half the cost of what the DOE is currently paying ($0.12 per tape vs. $0.28). DCAS has determined that the prices offered by GRM are fair and reasonable. Based on the DCAS analysis and the significant cost savings from consolidating DOE tape storage with that of other City agencies, DOE has also determined the pricing to be fair and reasonable and wishes to approve the contract for immediate use.

DCP has reviewed GRM's background in the City's VENDEX, Vendor CIP Report, and EPLS – Fed Debar List. No significant adverse information was revealed. Based on the background inquiry and GRM providing satisfactory services to DOE since 2006, this vendor has been determined to be responsible.