Panel for Educational Policy
Contract Agenda
November 12, 2009

Item: 1 **Description:** Evaluate the teaching model for a summer pilot (School of One).

Term: 4 Months **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Division of Human Resources **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Education Development Center	$42,000

Item: 2 **Description:** Use of Avery Fisher Hall to host a one day 2009 New Teacher Welcome event.

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

Division: Division of Human Resources **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Avery Fisher Hall	$34,876

Item: 3 **Description:** Conference space for the 2009 Social Studies Citywide Summer Institutes, a six day professional development training for approximately 300 New York City teachers.

Term: 6 Days **Options:** None **Funding:** Grant

Division: Teaching & Learning **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Lighthouse International	$71,319

Item: 4 **Description:** Document imaging, storage & data management services including form design, form and booklet production and distribution of printed materials to over 1400 sites (schools, Integrated Service Centers, contract agencies and central offices).

Term: 8 Months **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Office of Revenue Operations **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
SourceCorp BPS Inc	$1,316,989

Item: 5 **Description:** To amend this contract in order to establish a Help Desk to support the usage and adoption of the web-based Student Enrollment Management System (SEMS) for the term beginning April 1, 2009 and continuing through June 30, 2010.

Term: 14 Months **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Chancellor's District **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Vanguard Direct	$813,620

Item: 6 **Description:** Professional development using an online simulation program designed to train educators in using assessments to make instructional decisions that accelerate student learning.

Term: 4 Months **Options:** None **Funding:** Grant

Division: Special Education **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Liz Gewirtzman	$40,000

Item: 7 **Description:** To provide Saturday Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) preparation courses to students as well as diagnostic tes

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

Division: Community School District 20 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Princeton Review	$36,000

Item: 8 **Description:** Request by the Office of School & Youth Development (OYSD) to pay for services provided but not covered by the round one Twenty First Century grant.

Term: 1 Year **Options:** None **Funding:** Grant

Division: Community School District 10 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
The After School Corporation (TASC)	$41,140

Item: 9 **Description:** Amending UPK contracts to add full day services in areas of need throughout the city.

Term: 1 Year **Options:** None **Funding:** State/City Council/

Division: Teaching & Learning **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Briarwood Early Childhood Center	$338,000
New Milestone Inc.	$282,355
Samuel Field YM & YWHA	$454,885
Sesame Sprout	$589,140
Amalgamated Nursery School	$224,000
Round the clock Nursery Inc.	$727,622
Citizens Advise Bureau	$276,932
Christina Day Care, Inc. dba Blake and Milford	$131,469
The Family and Life Center of Mt. Ararat	$241,297
Harlem Children's Zone	$457,169
Urban Concepts of NY / Round the Clock Nursery Inc.	$128,117
Washington Heights Hellenic Orthodox Church	$501,700
Big Bird's Playhouse	$374,400
Castle Day Care	$193,320
Richmond Hill Children's Center	$211,500
The Children's Playhouse	$277,020
Educational Enterprises Inc. d/b/a The Foresight School	$471,020

Item: 10 **Description:** Provide transitional services to students in the form of an Alternate Learning Center (ALC) in Manhattan.

Term: 3 Years **Options:** 2 One Year Options to Extend **Funding:** Tax Levy

Division: Student Safety & Prevention **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Our Planet Management Institute, LTD (OPMI)	$371,800

Item: 11 **Description:** Consultative services for Job Order Contracting (JOC) system implementation, management and construction management services

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

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

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
The Gordian Group	$2,875,000

Item: 12 **Description:** Graduate and undergraduate colleges and universities offering NY State accredited degree programs in various areas of special education and related services.

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

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

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Adelphi University	$498,700
Bank Street College	$86,000
Brooklyn College-City University of New York	$66,000
College of Staten Island	$13,774
Columbia University	$452,285
D'Youville College	$25,000
Fordham University	$95,000
Research Foundation of CUNY/Hunter College, School of Educ	$55,900
Ithaca College	$20,294
Keuka College	$25,000
Lehman College	$128,000
Manhattan College	$45,000
Mercy College	$539,567
New York Institute of Technology	$139,585
New York University	$1,096,590
NYS Medical College School of Public Health	$64,029
Queens College the City University of New York	$28,920
SUNY-State University College at Buffalo	$25,000
SUNY-Health Science Center at Brooklyn	$45,248
Teachers College Columbia University	$450,000
Touro College	$346,012
Utica College of Syracuse University	$25,000
York College	$25,000

Item: 13 **Description:** Services to promote safe and supportive school communities through direct student services, and parent workshops. Conflict resolution, and bully prevention program services were some of the requested elements of this PQS since this solicitation replaced prior conflicts resolution RFP.

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

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Tanenbaum Center for Inter-Religious Understanding	$250,000
Youth Empowerment Mission, Inc.	$60,000

Item: 14 **Description:** Direct arts education services to students, related professional development and planning sessions, and/or direct services to parents.

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

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts D	$50,000

Item: 15 **Description:** Professional development and technical support services in career and technical education.

Term: 3 Years **Options:** 2 One Year Options to Renew **Funding:** Tax Levy and Fede

Division: Office of Charter Schools **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
USA Today	$60,000
National Academy Foundation	$150,000

Item: 16 **Description:** Supplemental programs to promote the integration of recreational and enrichment programming with academic studies.

Term: 5 Years **Options:** None **Funding:** Various, including

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Young Audiences New York Inc.	$50,000

Item: 17 **Description:** Professional development services for educators in instructional strategies, student-centered academic counseling services, sustainable leadership, quality teaching and student achievement in NYC schools.

Term: 5 Years **Options:** None **Funding:** Tax Levy and Reim

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
ASCD	$61,000

Item: 18 **Description:** Professional development for arts education services provides blueprint trainers, standards-based professional development, and instructional planning and support services.

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

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York	$115,000
National Choral Council	$60,000
Magic Box Productions, Inc.	$50,000

Item: 19 **Description:** Arts education direct student services, related professional development and planning sessions, and/or direct services to parents.

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

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Orchestra of St. Lukes	$75,000
New York City Ballet, Inc.	$75,000

Item: 20 **Description:** Professional development and direct student services for teaching elementary, middle and high school sciences.

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

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
After School Activity Program (A.S.A.P)	$25,000

Item: 21 **Description:** Professional development and direct student services in Special Education.

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

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Kaplan K 12 Learning Services, a division of Kaplan, Inc.	$400,000

Item: 22 **Description:** Processing and delivery of beef ravioli to the DOE's contracted food service distributors.

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

Division: School Food & Nutrition Services **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Hanover Foods	$1,286,190

Item: 23 **Description:** Pilot Program for Core Curriculum. This contract is for materials and incidental Professional Development.

Term: 3 Years **Options:** None **Funding:** Reimbursable, Tax

Division: Office of Purchasing Management **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
College Board	$500,000

Item: 24 **Description:** Commercial printing of various communications as needed by various DOE offices and schools.

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

Division: Contracts & Purchasing **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Vanguard Direct	$500,000

Item: 25 **Description:** Purchase and installation of diesel particulate filters on school buses so as to reduce emissions.

Term: 8 Months **Options:** None **Funding:** Grant

Division: Office of Pupil Transportation **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
HUSS, LLC	$2,496,320

Item: 26 **Description:** Comprehensive instructional technology professional development services through workshops, curriculum enrichment and mentorship programs throughout the department under this one year extension.

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

Division: Div. Of Inst. Support **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Tech4Learning, Inc.	$70,700
THIRTEEN (Educational Broadcasting Corporation	$50,000

Item: 27 **Description:** To provide staffing of temporary attorneys.

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

Division: Office of Legal Services **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
Strategic Legal Solutions dba Strategic Legal Resources	$250,000

Item: 28 **Description:** To conduct satisfaction surveys in NYC schools during the 2010-2011 school years.

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

Division: Assessment & Accountability **Contract Type:** Requirements

Vendor Name	Estimated Annual Amount
KPMG	$1,514,589

Item: 29 **Description:** To enrich student knowledge of U.S. History.

Term: 3 Months **Options:** None **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 24 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
American Social History Productions, Inc.	$58,208

Item: 30 **Description:** Training in American History content knowledge and specialized pedagogy to support teachers in their efforts to produce classroom materials and improve student achievement, understanding, and interest in American History.

Term: 2 Years **Options:** None **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 28 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
City Lore	$97,200

Item: 31 **Description:** To create or expand community learning centers to provide academic enrichment opportunities primarily to children who attend high-poverty and low performing schools and literacy as well as other educational services to their families.

Term: 1 Year **Options:** 3 One Year Renewal Options **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 19 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Groundwork, Inc	$42,500

Item: 32 **Description:** To provide evaluation services to all Title 1 Students in Need of Improvement (SINI) and Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) middle schools (14 schools) in CSDs 25, 28 and 29 participating in the Critical Themes in American History for Middle School Teachers.

Term: 3 Years **Options:** 2 One Year Renewal Options **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 28 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Houck Educational Consultants, LLC	$96,000

Item: 33 **Description:** Teachers as Historian Program

Term: 1 Year **Options:** None **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 17 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Literary Classics of the US dba/Library of America	$40,000

Item: 34 **Description:** Exploring History

Term: 1 Year **Options:** None **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 22 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Literary Classics of the US dba/Library of America	$60,000

Item: 35 **Description:** Title II B Math Science Partnership Supporting STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) for District 32,

Term: 1 Year **Options:** None **Funding:** State Funds

Division: Community School District 32 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
New York Institute of Technology	$47,000

Item: 36 **Description:** To create or expand community learning centers to provide academic enrichment opportunities primarily to children who attend high-poverty and low performing schools and literacy as well as other educational services to their families.

Term: 1 Year **Options:** 2 One Year Renewal Options **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 07 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Proposal Enterprises, Inc	$44,260

Item: 37 **Description:** To create or expand community learning centers to provide academic enrichment opportunities primarily to children who attend high-poverty and low performing schools and literacy as well as other educational services to their families.

Term: 1 Year **Options:** 2 One Year Renewal Options **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 09 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Proposal Enterprises, Inc	$55,000

Item: 38 **Description:** Elementary and secondary school counseling demonstration program to evaluate the implementation and outcome of a safe and drug free school.

Term: 1 Year **Options:** None **Funding:** Federal Funds

Division: Community School District 06 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Research Foundation for Mental Hygiene, Inc.	$60,000

Item: 39 **Description:** Learning History together, the content, documents and artifacts of United States history for the elementary grades.

Term: 1 Year **Options:** None **Funding:** Federal

Division: Community School District 32 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Research Works Inc.	$32,000

Item: 40 **Description:** To provide a teacher led online course for high school students to develop skills such as online collaboration, online communication and publishing.

Term: 1 Year **Options:** None **Funding:** State Funded

Division: Community School District 32 **Contract Type:** Full Value

Vendor Name	Annual Amount
Virtual High School	$110,500

Under $100,000 Exception Contract Summary
Education Development Center, Inc./Center for Children and Technology

Contract Cost	Projected Start and End Date	Procurement Method
Not to Exceed $42,000	6/22/09-10/22/09	Exception to Competitive Bidding

Service Requestor/Contract Manager
Joel Rose, Chief Executive for Human Capital
Office of Strategy and Innovation
212-374-6827

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This is a request for an exception in the amount of $42,000, on behalf of the Office of Strategy and Innovation (OSI), to utilize the services of Education Development Center, Inc./Center for Children and Technology (EDC/CCT). EDC/CCT will evaluate the teaching model for a summer pilot for a three year program, *School of One.* The *School of One* model supports a program of differentiated instruction specifically geared to students' abilities.

DISCUSSION

OSI contacted multiple providers for an evaluation of the pilot program and responses were received from EDC/CCT, New York University's Institute for Education and Social Policy (IESP) and the Institute for the Study of Knowledge Management in Education (ISKME). Although the offerings of three providers were considered, the procurement was not publicly advertised. Accordingly, this is processed as an exception.

OSI chose EDC/CCT because it offers the most complete range of analysis and evaluation report formats for the first year pilot. Further, this vendor has experience with programs and grants awarded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), which OSI hopes to have fund the model after the pilot. EDC/CCT offered to deliver a three-layered evaluation, with summative and formative evaluations as well as a third report integrating OSI's commentary and revisions.

An evaluation was conducted by a former Senior Vice President for Education with Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) who found that EDC/CCT demonstrated a clearer understanding of the overall project when compared to the other two proposers. This was demonstrated by EDC/CCT's detailed proposal that included specific timelines and the tasks associated, data requirements from the DOE required to track the students included in this program, close-out strategies and reporting guidelines.

EDC/CCT includes planning (meeting with DOE staff to review data collection, analysis procedures and previewing instructional modules and learning objectives), data gathering during the field-test (two field researchers attending an average of 12 of the 20 field-test days, and analyzing data and summarizing findings in memos to the project team), cleaning of pre-post student performance data, statistical analysis of performance data, and writing and revising the Evaluation Report.

On a comparative basis, the proposals from NYU/IESP ($25,000) and ISKME ($29,000) were less costly, but OSI concluded that the breadth and scope of the services offered by EDC/CCT warrants the additional expense.

The total cost of this exception is $42,000 which will cover three (3) phases of work:

- Phase 1 – Planning and Preparation: June 22, 2009 – June 30, 2009
- Phase 2 – Data Collection: July 6, 2009 – August 6,2009 (approx.)
- Phase 3 – Data Analysis and Reporting: August 6, 2009 – October 22, 2009.

Payments for these services will be made in two installments as follows:

- The first payment ($18,000) is due upon execution of the agreement and covers Phase 1 of the program (180 hrs x $100/hr).
- The second payment ($24,000) is due upon submission of the final report and covers Phases 2 and 3 (240 hrs x $100/hr).

Under $100,000 Exception Contract Summary
Avery Fisher Hall at Lincoln Center

Contract Cost	Projected Start and End Date	Procurement Method
Not to Exceed $34,876	8/25/2008	Exception to Competitive Bidding

Service Requestor/Contract Manager
Richard Green, Director of Marketing and Analysis
Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality (TRQ)
718-935-2838

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This is a request for an exception in the amount of $34,876, on behalf of the Office of Teacher Recruitment and Quality (TRQ), for the use of Avery Fisher Hall at Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, Inc. (Avery Fisher Hall) on August 25, 2008 for the 2008 New Teacher Welcome Event.

DISCUSSION

TRQ hosts New Teacher Welcome Events annually as a celebration for newly hired teachers. TRQ originally estimated that the total cost of the event at Avery Fisher Hall would be under $25,000 hence there was no attempt to procure these services as a formal contract through the Division of Contracts and Purchasing. Price comparisons were sought by TRQ and three vendors were identified, Avery Fisher Hall, the New York Marriott at the Brooklyn Bridge and Grand Prospect Hall. Pricing and a budget breakdown were not submitted by the New York Marriott because it was not able to accommodate the conference on August 28th. The Grand Prospect Hall submitted an estimate of $56,500, including $42,000 for breakfast and a snack for 1200 attendees.

Avery Fisher Hall quoted TRQ $30,226 for the event, which included the cost of the stage hand labor for sound system and system set-up, and the other ancillary charges for the ticket printing, security and "Front of House" personnel, without meals, but their capacity is more than double that of Grand Prospect Hall.

TRQ elected to use Avery Fisher Hall because the facility could accommodate the originally anticipated 1200 attendees and the cost was less than the $56,500 quoted by Grand Prospect Hall. Closer to the event, TRQ was told that due to the early load-in time for equipment on the day of the event, stage hand labor costs would increase to $17,650 from the originally estimated $6,000, but it was already too late to change venues. Policy and Vendor Performance (P&VP) spoke with Avery Fisher about the additional charges of $11,650 and a reduction of $7,000 was negotiated reducing the additional labor charges of $4,650. In addition, a fee of $2,750 was paid to Bornstein Audio by Avery Fisher Hall directly at the request of TRQ.

Therefore the information provided can be determined to support a conclusion that the pricing be deemed fair and reasonable.

Under $100,000 Exception Contract Summary
The Lighthouse International – A Grant Application

Contract Cost	Projected Start and End Date	Procurement Method
Not to Exceed $64,407	July 14-16 & July 21-23, 2009	Exception to Competitive Bidding

Service Requestor/Contract Manager
Anna Commitante, Director
Department of English Language Arts, Social Studies and Gifted & Talented
(718) 636-5800

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This is an exception request for the Department of English Language Arts, Social Studies and Gifted & Talented (ELA), to use The Lighthouse International (Lighthouse) for the 2009 *Social Studies Citywide Summer Institutes,* a six day professional development training for approximately 300 New York City teachers of grades 5 and 8.

DISCUSSION

The Department had a contract with Lighthouse that expired in June 2009. Unaware that the contract was soon to expire, in May 2009, ELA arranged to utilize the services of Lighthouse from July 14-16 and July 21-23, 2009. Moreover, these Summer Institutes are paid for with USDOE grant funds which were scheduled to close on September 2009. ELA has since requested and received an extension for the use of the USDOE grant funds to January 4, 2010. If the vendor is not paid by that date, the DOE will lose the availability of the federal grant to make payment.

The DOE *Social Studies Summer Institutes* included keynote addresses by leaders in their field of education and included morning and afternoon workshops focusing on the implementation of the new scope and sequence in social studies, utilizing the new Core Curriculum materials.

The total cost of the six day event was $64,407 (reduced from $71,319) which included a theatre room, eight breakout rooms, audiovisual equipment, auditorium lighting system, support personnel (security, custodial staff, waiting staff and audiovisual technicians) and breakfast for approximately 300 teachers. ELA sought and received bids from the New York Marriott at the Brooklyn Bridge (NYMB) and Marenzana Conference Center (MCC). NYMB submitted a bid at $81,675 for three General Session rooms and 10 breakout rooms, audiovisual equipment, support staff and breakfast for three days. Based on six days, NYMB rate would equate to $163,350. MCC submitted a bid at $53,910 for one theatre room and seven breakout rooms, audiovisual equipment, technical support and breakfast for three days. Based on six days, MCC rate would equate to $107,820.

Although the cost per participant for breakfast offered by Lighthouse is above the $12.00 maximum allowance per person for DOE sponsored meetings or retreats, Lighthouse's pricing is consistent with the pricing in the expired contract. Further, Lighthouse's price is significantly lower than NYBM and MMC. Therefore, Lighthouse's pricing can be deemed fair and reasonable.

ELA has been advised to contact the Division of Contracts and Purchasing in order to initiate a competitive process should these services be required in the future.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION

SourceCorp, Inc to provide Document Imaging, Storage and Data Management Services.

Contract Cost	**Funding Source**	**Contract Term**	**Procurement Method**	**Is Contract Retroactive?**	**Contract Type**
$1,316,989	**Tax Levy**	**1/1/10 to 8/31/10**	**Committee on Contracts**	**NO**	**Requirements**
Vendor Name & Address	**SourceCorp BPS, Inc**				
	30 Wall Street				
	Binghamton, NY				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	**Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact**
Carl Schneider, Executive Director	Doreen Williams, Director
Division of Revenue Operations	Division of Contracts & Purchasing (DCP)
718-935-3464	718-935-4341

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into a contract with SourceCorp, Inc, an organization that provides document imaging, storage & data management services. The fee for said services will not exceed $1,316,989 throughout the life of the agreement. The contract will be active for eight (8) months beginning on January 1, 2010 through August 31, 2010.

DISCUSSION

SourceCorp will provide Document Imaging, Storage & Data Management Services. Sourcecorp provides a variety of services including form design, form and booklet production and distribution to over 1400 sites (schools, Integrated Service Centers (ISC's), contract agencies and central offices). The forms are used to collect information used to generate millions of dollars in funding for the Department of Education for State aid and Medicaid, as well as the production of New York State Education Department Mandated reports.

SourceCorp has been providing these services since 2003 under the terms of an MOU and contract (contract #C140229) based on an existing Workman's Compensation Board (WCB) contract for similar services. The contract expires on December 31, 2009, which is in the middle of the upcoming school year. The forms and booklets that will be in the schools at the contract expiration are valid through the end of the school year. Therefore this eight month contract would serve as a bridge to extend the processing of Special Education attendance forms until the end of the school year. Switching to a new vendor before the end of the school year would require a new vendor to use forms which are not optimized for the technical resources and processes they have in effect in their company.

The Division of Revenue Operations is currently working with the Division of Contracts and Purchasing to issue an RFP to cover these services beginning with the new school year commencing on September 1, 2010. The eight month extension of services by SourceCorp will allow ample time to transition to a new vendor.

The Committee on Contracts approved this Exception on May 15, 2009, for an amount not to exceed $1,316,989 with a contract term from January 1, 2010 through August 31, 2010. The rationale for approval was continuity.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION

Vanguard Direct to provide Help Desk services for the Student Enrollment Management System (SEMS)

Contract Cost	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$813,620	Tax Levy	04/01/09-06/30/10	CoC Amendment	Yes	Fixed Price
Vendor Name & Address	Vanguard Direct				
	519 8TH Avenue, 23rd Floor, New York, NY 10118				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager:	**Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact**
Robert Sanft, Chief Operating Officer	TaRel Hardy, Procurement Analyst
Office of Student Enrollment Planning and Operations	Division of Contracts & Purchasing
212-374-6702	718-935-4083

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Chancellor's approval is sought to amend the Vanguard Direct contract (#9953041) in the amount of $813,620 in order to establish a Help Desk to support the usage and adoption of the web-based Student Enrollment Management System (SEMS) for the term beginning April 1, 2009 and continuing through June 30, 2010.

DISCUSSION

SEMS supports two core functions of the Office of Student Enrollment. First, SEMS allows central and school-based administrative staff review and rank applications for students in the various enrollment process run centrally by the DOE. Those include pre-kindergarten admissions, kindergarten lotteries, elementary school gifted and talented admissions, and the middle school choice process. Based on usage rates modeled off of the existing High School Application Processing System (HSAPS) we expect 5000 individuals to use the system in this manner. There are already several hundred middle school principals using the system.

Second, SEMS allows for any user from the general public to create and submit an online application for the aforementioned pre-kindergarten and gifted and talented enrollment processes. Based on last year's applications we anticipate upwards of 25,000 individuals accessing the system to apply for one or both of these admissions processes. The pre-

kindergarten process from which we anticipated generating 20,000 users alone started on Friday, March 6, 2009.

Given the large and rapidly growing numbers of SEMS users, it is critical that there is a robust support system to expeditiously and effectively answer questions about the tool's functionality. The current requirements as described in RFP #0536, which underlies the contract, do not provide for a Help Desk. In order to address that, this amendment provides for Vanguard Direct to provide Help Desk services in addition to the current product development work as defined in the contract.

The Committee on Contracts reviewed and approved this proposed amendment request based on Vanguard's first hand involvement in the creation of SEMS. They posses a level of familiarity with the system that makes them uniquely qualified to perform the requested services. Nevertheless, the program office has been advised that any future services must be competitively procured.

In conducting a price analysis, the Office of Policy and Vendor Performance compared Vanguard's pricing with rates in a competitively awarded contract the DOE has with Hewlett Packer (HP) for similar services. Vanguard's cost per-call of $2.71 is significantly lower than the quoted rate of $7.06 per-call by HP.

Vendors	Est. Calls Per Month	Cost Per Call	Cost Per Month
Vanguard	* 20,000	$2.71	$54,241
HP	* 20,000	$7.06	$141,200

Based on the information provided, it can be determined that the prices submitted by Vanguard be deemed fair and reasonable.

Under $100,000 Exception Contract Summary
Liz Gewirtzman

Contract Cost	Projected Start and End Date	Procurement Method
Not to Exceed $40,000	5/15/09-9/30/09	Exception to Competitive Bidding

Service Requestor/Contract Manager
Irma Zardoya, Executive Director
Office of Children First Intensive
212-374-4243

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This is exception is part of a total program cost of $110,000 on behalf of the Office of Children First Intensive (OCFI) to utilize the services of Liz Gewirtzman (LG), a specialist in developing comprehensive school reform models that focus on the "Inquiry Process" (IP). The program began May 15, 2009. The cost for the period from May 15 through August 15 was paid for with private funds. The period from August 15 to September 30, 2009 is being paid using grant monies provided by the US Department of Education.

DISCUSSION

IP is an alternative approach to educational methods launched by OCFI citywide in 2007-08. The inquiry process applies an alternative understanding of schooling as a collective, humanistic process of creating knowledge through practice and reflection. LG designed and built an online simulation entitled "Taming Assessments Simulation" (TAS) to train educators to use assessments. The simulation includes a user guide for principals on how to incorporate the simulation into professional development opportunities for their teachers. LG provided services beginning on May 15, 2009 and will be finished on September 30, 2009.

The need to create TAS grew out of New York City's deepening work with IP. LG is uniquely qualified to work on TAS as she is the initial designer of the IP. When IP work was expanded to the Empowerment Schools Intensive in 2006-2007, LG developed a simulation tool that lets users experience the inquiry process online. This tool will be linked with TAS, which will have a guide for principals.

The total cost for this project is $110,000. Liz Gewirtzman has offered $16,000 in in-kind services. The $70,000 cost for initial development of the TAS website was paid for by a separate private grant from Dell. The $40,000 balance will be covered by a United States Department of Education grant, but the grant did not identify LG specifically, so this exception is necessary

Under $100,000 Exception Contract Summary
The Princeton Review

Contract Cost	Projected Start and End Date	Procurement Method
Not to Exceed $36,000	1/10/09-4/25/09	Exception to Competitive Bidding

Service Requestor/Contract Manager
Xhenete Shepard, Assistant Principal for Organization
High School for Telecommunication Arts and Technology
(718) 759-3400

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This is a request on behalf of the High School of Telecommunication Arts and Technology (HSTAT), to utilize the services of The Princeton Review (TPR) for providing SAT prep courses to students of HSTAT during Saturday classes and diagnostic test days.

DISCUSSION

HSTAT received quotes from TPR, Kaplan, Inc. (Kaplan) and Sylvan Learning (Sylvan). TPR's course provides personal attention and a variety of additional services that were, overall, preferred by HSTAT.

Sylvan quoted a rate of $250 per student, Kaplan quoted $1,149 per student and TPR offered $999 per student. While considerably more expensive than Sylvan, TPR offered one-on-one assistance, online access and the guarantee that more instruction will be offered free for up to one year if the student is unsatisfied with the grade obtained.

The above notwithstanding, the school has been advised that future services of this nature should be procured through an open competitive process. Accordingly, the school's administrators have been advised to contact the Office of School Based Procurement to initiate the process.

Further, TPR was notified by letter dated August 9, 2009 that schools do not have the authority to execute contracts above $25,000 and the NYCDOE expects TPR to abide by that standard in its contact with NYCDOE schools and offices.

Based on this information provided by the client, and research conducted by P&VP, it can be determined that the rates charged by TPR are fair and reasonable.

Under $100,000 Exception Contract Summary
The After School Corporation

Contract Cost	Projected Start and End Date	Procurement Method
Not to Exceed $41,140	7/1/07-6/30/08	Exception to Competitive Bidding

Service Requestor/Contract Manager
Elayna Konstan, Chief Executive Officer
Office of School and Youth Development
212-374-0842

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This is a request from the Office of School and Youth Development (OSYD) for an exception to pay $41,140 to The After School Corporation (TASC) for providing after school services.

DISCUSSION

TASC was written into a 21st Century grant that was awarded to District 10. In FY08, the total grant award was for $212,077. The grant outlined that TASC would receive $164,560 to provide program and fiscal management for five different schools. TASC's initial plan was that three of the five schools would receive $41,140 of services and two schools would receive $20,570 for a total of $164,560. DOE staff misinterpreted emails from TASC and moved forward with an understanding that TASC would provide $41,140 worth of services in five schools for a total of $205,700. Without realizing this error, DOE staff informed TASC that its total FY08 allocation would be $205,700 and TASC provided services accordingly. OSYD has the funds available to cover the expenses incurred for the services rendered to District 10 and requested this exception in order to pay TASC as a matter of good faith.

TASC acts as an administrative liaison to community-based organizations (CBO) that operate after school programs in order to facilitate the implementation of the 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant. TASC acts as an intermediary and subcontracts out to smaller vendors to provide after school services for these schools. In order to provide the highest level of service, TASC offers multiple training programs, seminars and workshops to prepare staff for child and youth development and community strengthening. Each TASC supported program is supervised by a full time onsite coordinator and staffed by a diverse mix of teachers, parents, paraprofessionals, college students, youth workers and artists.

Price comparisons were sought by OSYD and two vendors were identified. The Leadership Program (TLP) and Learning Through an Expanded Arts Program (LEAP). TLP has an after school program that includes one after school club per day including Video, Drama, Hip Hop, Yoga and Basketball. The total fee for service through TLP is $57,885 per school. Included in the cost are all supplies, materials and equipment as well as an onsite facilitator. LEAP offers a sports program that includes but is not limited to basketball, soccer, fencing and track and field at a cost of $39,750 per school.

TASC's fee falls between the two comparison prices and, in that it is much closer to the lower one, that only serves to supports a conclusion that TASC's price is fair and reasonable.

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT TO CONTRACTS

TO AMEND THE REQUIREMENTS AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED PROVIDERS OF SERVICES IN THE UNIVERSAL PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

New Total Estimated Contract Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$5,879,946	State + City Council + Tax Levy	One-Year Amendment	Exception to Competitive Bidding	No	Requirement
Vendor Name & Address	See Table Below				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact
Recy Dunn, Executive Director	Maxine Needle, UPK Director
Division of Teaching and Learning	Division of Contracts and Purchasing
(212) 374-2324	(718) 935-4355

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Approval is sought to amend contracts with seventeen (17) vendors listed in the table below to provide Full Day Universal Prekindergarten (UPK) services for four-year-olds. The term of amendment is only one year and will change the vendors' current half day (HD) contracts to provide full day (FD) services. The overall term of the contracts remains unchanged. The original contracted half day price per seat remains unchanged.

Borough	CSD	Vendor's Legal Name	RFP/ APP	# of Original Half Day contracted seats FY'10	Annual Contract Amount for HD FY'10	# of Full Day Seats As Awarded	Cost per Child for Full Day Seats	Awarded # of Half Day Seats FY'10 As	Total Full Day+ Half Day 1year Contract Amount As Amended
Q	28	Briarwood Center	R0051	58	$203,000	18	$7,500	58	$338,000
Q	25	New Milestone, Inc	R0217	40	$132,114	20	$7,512	40	$282,355
Q	26	Samuel Field YM & YWHA/Bay Terrace/Little Neck	A0608	90	$305,613	18	$8,293	90	$454,885

Borough	CSD	Vendor's Legal Name	RFP/ APP	# of Original Half Day contracted seats FY'10	Annual Contract Amount for HD FY'10	# of Full Day Seats As Awarded	Cost per Child for Full Day Seats	Awarded # of Half Day Seats FY'10 As	Total Full Day+ Half Day 1year Contract Amount As Amended
Q	24	Sesame Spout	R0051	151	$513,306	9	$8,426	151	$589,140
X	10	Amalgamated Nursery School	A0709	40	$132,000	20	$7,900	20	$224,000
X	10	Round The Clock Nursery, Inc.	A0709	126	$450,702	60	$7,000	86	$727,622
X	9	The Citizen's Advice Bureau	R0051	54	$188,892	20	$7,900	34	$276,932
K	19	Christina Daycare Inc	R0217	18	$63,000	18	$7,304		$131,469
K	23	The Family And Life Center Of Mt. Ararat	R0051	36	$126,000	36	$6,703		$241,297
M	5	Harlem Children's Zone, Inc.	R0051	82	$231,339	40	$7,409	57	$457,169
M	5	Urban Concepts Of NY Round The Clock Nursery, Inc.	R0051	20	$68,000	20	$6,406		$128,117
M	6	Washington Heights Hellenic Orthodox Community, St. Spyridon	R0051	90	$310,500	38	$8,300	54	$501,700
R	31	Big Bird's Playhouse Corp.	A0709	90	$306,000	18	$7,200	72	$374,400
R	31	Castle Day Care LI	A0608	30	$99,960	20	$8,000	10	$193,320
R	31	Richmond Hill Children's Center	R0061	36	$135,000	18	$8,000	18	$211,500
R	31	The Children's Playhouse, Inc	A0608	48	$165,360	18	$8,500	36	$277,020
R	31	Educational Enterprises	A0709	107	$370,220	20	$8,500	87	$471,020
								Total:	$5,879,946

DISCUSSION

In September, the Office of Early Childhood Education received an allocation from the New York City Council for $2.75 million to fund an expansion of full day services in areas of high need. Of the $2.75 million, $1.75 million dollars will be allocated for current DOE contracted vendors. The rest will go to public school pre-k programs. Due to the late notification of the funding, a standard competitive process was not feasible for the current school year.

The NYCDOE solicited 45 contracted UPK vendors in areas of demonstrated need throughout the five boroughs to provide full day UPK services. Vendors were offered a choice of converting all or a portion of their current contracted number of half day seats to full day seats; or to continue providing half day UPK services with the current contracted number of seats and add additional full day seats; or to convert their current contracted number of half day seats to full day seats and add additional full day seats.

Demonstrated need was based on city-wide surveys of enrollment patterns, capacity analysis, and new public school construction impact. It was conducted by the Office of Early Childhood Education, the Office of Student Enrollment, and the Office of Portfolio Development.

ACS contracted vendors were ineligible to participate in this solicitation as ACS conducted a separate process.

There was close communication with the City Council throughout this analysis to ensure that their expectations and desired criteria to ensure sustainability of funding were met. Vendors' space constraints and the fact that the school year was already underway resulted in 21 vendors choosing not to apply.

Submissions were evaluated and scored by borough teams based on the parameters outlined in the table below. Scoring for demonstrated effectiveness and site visit were based on the last instructional review. A minimum of 80 points out of 100 had to be earned in order to be considered. Negotiations on price were conducted with 18 vendors that scored 80 or more points. Trinity Lutheran Evangelical Church, District 31, Staten Island, although meeting the cut-off, asked to be removed from consideration.

SCORING TABLE:

Response Category	Desired Characteristics	Maximum Points
Program Plan	In a clear, professional, and highly rational manner the Program Plan for providing the required services must include Philosophy, Instructional Plan, Program Structure, Professional Development, and Family Involvement Plan.	**20 Points**
Organizational Capacity	Strong and unequivocal evidence that the organization's human, organizational, technical, and professional resources and abilities can support the proposed services.	**20 Points**
Demonstrated Effectiveness	Evidence of prior successful experience that is detailed and directly related to the proposed services.	**20 Points**
Site Visit	Site visit must reflect Program Plan, Organizational Capacity and Demonstrated Effectiveness	**40 Points**
Total		**100 POINTS**

On September 24, 2009 the Committee on Contracts convened, reviewed and approved the above named vendors to contract for UPK services for a term of one (1) year from 09/15/09 through 6/30/10 for a total cost of $1,750,000 million dollars. The Committee recommend approval for only one year. If the City Council allocates funds for similar programs in the future, the Director of Teaching and Learning will do a competitive procurement if there is sufficient time.

AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH OUR PLANET MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE, LTD (OPMI) TO PROVIDE CLASS G (EDUCATIONAL SPACE) AND PROVIDE SERVICES FOR AN ALTERNATE LEARNING CENTER (ALC) IN MANHATTAN- RFP # R0773

General Information

Contract Annual Amount	Contract Total Amount	Funding Source	Terms	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?
Year 1: $ 349,333 Year 2: $ 338,800 Year 3: $ 371,800 Year 4: $ 371,800 Year 5: $ 371,800	$1,803,533	Tax Levy	Three (3) Years: on or about 01/01/2010 -to- 12/31/2012, plus two (2) 1-Year options to extend until 12/31/14	RFP	No
Vendor					
Our Planet Management Institute, LTD (OPMI) 116 John Street Suite 200 (2nd Floor) New York, NY 10038					

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact
Anna Alexandrakis-Pappas, Senior Procurement & Grants Officer	Bashar Assana, Procurement Analyst
Office of School and Youth Development ("OSYD")	Division of Contracts and Purchasing ("DCP") Professional Services Unit
(212) 374-5470	(718) 935-3624

Statement of Purpose

Approval is sought to contract with Our Planet Management Institute, LTD (OPMI) to provide transitional services to students in the form of an Alternate Learning Center (ALC). ALCs serve students who are removed from their assigned home schools due to violations of the NYC Student Discipline Code that warrant a Superintendent's Suspension. This Request for Authorization (RA) will result in the award of a full-value contract with OPMI. The term of the contract is three (3) years beginning on or about January 1, 2010 and continuing through December 31, 2012, with two (2) 1- year options to extend until December 31, 2014. The total contract amount for the five years is $1,803,533.

Discussion

A Request for Bid (RFB) was not done because the services required can not be effectively evaluated and compared on price alone. ALCs provide small classroom settings for individualized instruction, support and counseling services for students. They serve a maximum of 80 students per site, with suspensions ranging from 6 to 90 days. A Request for Proposals (RFP # R0773) was issued in July 2009, seeking proposals from organizations that can provide Class G Educational space in Manhattan as well as prevention and intervention services to students, helping transition these students back to their home schools.

While most ALCs are located in NYCDOE facilities, there is a shortage of NYCDOE space mainly during the school year. The RFP initially requested one proposed site, and was later amended to identify "up to" two (2) suitable sites in Manhattan, based on budget availability. Although the site(s) were required to be available for the 10 month-school year period, vendors had the option to propose for the two optional summer months, in the event the NYCDOE was to utilize the site during summer months.

Jordon Educational Consulting Company ("JECC") and Our Planet Management Institute, LTD (OPMI) submitted proposals in response to this RFP. The first stage of the evaluation process consisted of the site visit, which was conducted by the Division of School Facilities (DSF), the evaluation committee ("the Committee") and a representative from DCP. The site proposed by JECC was deemed unfit for an ALC site as it did not meet the requirements for Class 'G' (Educational) Certificate of Occupancy including fire safety requirements. In addition, the site proposed by JECC was not suitable, would require more than four (4) months of construction and they were considerably more expensive than the OPMI offering.

The OPMI site was deemed to be acceptable and, through negotiations, pricing was reduced from $2,253,880 to $2,028,973, a $224,907 reduction. Further, OSYD decided not to utilize OPMI's ALC site for the summer months as they will utilize a NYCDOE facility (Manhattan ALC site). This decision will save the NYCDOE approximately $225,440 and resulted in future reductions to $1,803,533.

A comparison with other competitively awarded contracts for similar services showed OPMI price to be cheaper.

A background check revealed no adverse information that would preclude award. The organization is therefore deemed responsible.

The chart below indicates pricing offered by the awarded vendor (school Year):

Final BAFO – OPMI (School Year Only) - OSYD will not utilize OPMI's ALC site for the summer Months	
Years	School Year
1	$349,333
2	$338,800
3	$371,800
4	$371,800
5	$371,800
Contract Total Amount	**$1,803,533**

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION
Job Order Contracting System Management

Contract Cost	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
Estimated 5 Year Amount is $14,375,000	Tax Levy	5 years	RFP	No	Requirements
Vendor Name & Address	The Gordian Group				
	140 Bridges Road Suite E Mauldin, South Carolina 296				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager:	Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact:
Volkert Braren Contract Manager	Shelley Epstein, Procurement Analyst
Division of School Facilities	Division of Contracts & Purchasing
718-610-0214	718-935-2066 / 718-935-2095

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Chancellor's approval is sought to contract with The Gordian Group (TGG) to provide a Job Order Contracting System Management Service, consisting of Consultative Services for JOC System Implementation and Management (Component A) and Construction Management Services to manage the JOC contractors who actually perform the work (Component B). The current contract expires on November 30, 2009. This is a five (5) year contract. The estimated annual cost for Component A is $450,000 plus a 10% reserve for additional services and work, and $2, 425,000 for Component B, plus a 10% reserve for additional services. The total cost for five years is $14,375,000 pursuant to a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP).

DISCUSSION

Job Order Contracts are multi-tasked repair and construction requirements contracts that have a predetermined price for each type of repair. They allow DSF to coordinate complex, multi-trade projects with one contractor. These complex repairs, maintenance and capital improvement projects require the expertise of specialists in construction to complete projects of this magnitude. DSF does not have the staff necessary to manage these capital projects and must therefore, outsource these services.

The RFP was released in March 2009 and vendors were able to propose on one or both components. Vendors proposing on both components were asked to offer a discount should they be awarded both. Five (5) proposals were received with four (4) proposers responding to Component B only and one (1) proposer responding to Components A& B.

The selection committee included the following from DSF: the Director of Finance, a Deputy Director of Program Management, a Borough Maintenance Planner, a Deputy Director of Facilities, and a Borough Contract Manager.

Component A.

The Gordian Group (TGG) was the only vendor to propose on the much smaller Component A. The committee agreed that their proposal was thorough, clear and responsive. As such, the committee felt an oral presentation was not needed. The proposal fee of 1.5% was based on a $30 million JOC Program and the same as the previous competitively awarded contract that was amended to include these services and was in place for the last five (5) years. In addition, TGG offered a .25% discount on Part B if they were to be awarded both components, resulting in a slightly lower fee than the previous contract. The Policy and Vendor Performance Unit (PVP) reached out to the Pennsylvania Department of General Services who confirmed that its fee on their consulting contract with TGG on a sliding scale is between 5% and 2% which is higher than what the DOE is paying. TGG confirmed that these are their standard JOC consulting fees and that no agency or firm is getting a lower rate than the DOE. TGG's pricing can be deemed fair and reasonable for Component A.

Component B

After reviewing the five proposals for Component B, the committee agreed to eliminate Armand/Ibex JV and Tri-Line. Although Tri-Line and Armand's proposals offered lower fees than the other proposals, the committee felt that the other three proposals showed more understanding of the scope of work and were more responsive in all other evaluation criteria areas. Tri-Line had no experience with construction/renovation in schools. Their proposal did not demonstrate an understanding of the JOC system or the Construction Task Catalog pricing method. Their program plan lacked detailed strategies. Armand's proposal was not detailed and did not show experience with the JOC system. The committee felt that their pricing was so low that it indicated a lack of understanding of the scope of work.

Three vendors TGG, United Research Services (URS) and ANADAC Facilities Group (AFG) were invited for oral presentations and interviews. After the orals, URS and TGG scored the highest based on their qualifications, experience and understanding of the required service and appeared able to manage this program at a reasonable cost. BAFO's were requested from both. URS slightly reduced their pricing and offered an alternate pricing method. However, both pricing methods from URS were significantly higher than the pricing from TGG. TGG's annual cost for Component B was $2,425,000 compared to URS's cost of $3,000,000.

PVP Unit conducted a comprehensive background check on TGG and found one self reported caution in Vendex concerning a subpoena received by the vendor on September 18, 2006 from the NYC Attorney General (AG). The subpoena, requesting corporate records, Vendex forms, contracts, payments, bids and other such documents was related

to an on-going investigation of DOE construction and maintenance vendors. The TGG supplied all requested documents on September 27, 2006 and there has been no other inquiries regarding this investigation.

TGG also self reported that in January 2003 there was an SCI subpoena pertaining to an investigation of alleged corruption, unethical conduct, conflicts of interest pertaining to work performed by DOE construction contractors. Among the listed vendors was Eastco Building Services. Two Eastco principals were implicated by the SCI but no Gordian principals, officers or managerial employees were involved. It had been determined by the SCI that at one or two sites these construction companies may have taken short cuts in their work. The vendor poured concrete without notifying the TGG project inspector in advance and without calling for an inspection. As a result of the investigation, DOE asked TGG to terminate an inspector who had authorized final payments after a final inspection but without proper documentation for any interim site inspections on several jobs. TGG cooperated with DOE in developing additional operating procedures to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

Finally, TGG self reported was an incident in 2001 with the Housing Authority of Kansas City. The Housing Authority sued TGG when they realized one of the procured contractors was over charging them. TGG counter sued saying the Housing Authority had not used the system properly and thus the contractor was able to take advantage. This matter was settled out of court with a non-disclosure provision.

TGG is the current contracted vendor providing these services and DSF has deemed their performance to be satisfactory. TGG has successfully provided consulting services and managed work performed under the JOC system for DSF. They have provided full project tracking, developed cost proposals and provided project scheduling. They have performed the work in a complete, timely and professional manner and their business integrity has proven them to be a responsible contractor. Since there was competition for Component B (5 proposals) the prices were deemed fair and reasonable.

A cursory review of their financials has determined that TGG has the financial capacity to service this contract.

On average the prices on Component A are the same as the previous contract and the prices on Component B are 1 % lower than the previous contract. The lower prices and competitiveness of their rates in comparison with the other proposals allow us to conclude that prices are fair and reasonable.

Proposals

Component A

Construction Cost Range	TGG Fee Percentage
$0 - $5,000,000	1.95%
$5,000,001 - $10,000,000	1.95%
$10,000,001 - $15,000,000	1.75%
$15,000,001 - $20,000,000	1.75%
Over $20,000,000	1.50%

The committee agreed that the Gordian Group proposal was thorough, clear and responsive. The average score was 80 and the committee agreed to award Component A to TGG.

Component B

Construction Cost Range	TGG Fee Percentage	Tri-Line Fee Percentage	URS Fee Percentage	Armand Fee Percentage	AFG Fee Percentage
$0 - $5,000,000	10.25%	14.29%	45%	4% - 7.5%	15%
$5,000,001 - $10,000,000	10.25%	6.21%	30%	3% - 4.5%	14%
$10,000,001 - $15,000,000	10.00%	5.98%	25%	2.5% - 3.75%	13%
$15,000,001 - $20,000,000	9.75%	5.25%	18%	2.5% - 3.75%	12%
Over $20,000,000	9.50	5.01%	15%	3%	11%

First Down Select: Based on the criteria in the bid, the committee scored TGG, URS and AFG the highest. All committee members agreed they were the most responsive and the three were invited for oral presentations.

Second Down Select: After oral presentations, the committee felt that TGG and URS gave satisfactory answers to their questions, had the necessary qualifications, resources, experience and understanding of the required services and were able to implement and manage the program at a reasonable cost. BAFO's were requested from both vendors.

Best and Final Offer

Construction Cost Range	TGG Fee Percentage	URS Fee Percentage
$0 - $5,000,000	10.25%	36%
$5,000,001 - $10,000,000	10.25%	19%
$10,000,001 - $15,000,000	10.00%	16%
$15,000,001 - $20,000,000	9.75%	13%
Over $20,000,000	9.50	12%

Committee recommends TGG.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION

For the provision of Scholarship Programs for Special Education in Teaching and Clinical Disciplines and for Related Services – RFP R0725.

Total Estimated Contracts Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$21,482,520	Tax Levy	Five Years 9/1/09-8/31/14	RFP	No	Requirements
Vendor Name & Address	See Table Below for Awardees and Contract Data				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	**Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact**
Peter Ianniello	Stephen Stamo, Procurement Analyst
Division of Human Resources	Division of Contracts & Purchasing
718-935-4193	718-935-4360
Service Requestor/Contract Manager	
Ava Mopper	
Office of Related and Contractual Services	
212-374-2317	

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into requirements agreements with eligible providers for the provision of scholarship programs for special education in teaching and clinical disciplines and for related services. All of the contracts will be active for five (5) years commencing on or around September 1, 2009 and terminating on or around August 31, 2014 for an estimated total annual amount of $4,296,504.

The service providers are as follows, each indicating the discipline for which they will be eligible to provide services.

	VENDOR NAME	COMPONENTS	ESTIMATED ANNUAL AMOUNT	DISCIPLINE*
1.	Adelphi University	1	$498,700	SE, SW, SLP
2.	Bank Street College of Education	1	$86,000	SE
3.	Brooklyn College (CUNY)	1	$66,600	SC, SP, SLP
4.	College of Staten Island	2	$13,774	PT
5.	Columbia University	2	$452,285	OT, PT
6.	D'Youville College	2	$25,000	OT, PT
7.	Fordham University	1	$95,000	SW, SE, SC, SP
8.	Hunter College (CUNY)	1	$55,900	BVI, SLP
9.	Ithaca College	2	$20,294	OT
10.	Keuka College	2	$25,000	OT
11.	Lehman College	1	$128,000	SE, SW, SC, SLP

	VENDOR NAME	COMPONENTS	ESTIMATED ANNUAL AMOUNT	DISCIPLINE*
12.	Manhattan College	1	$45,000	SE, SC
13.	Mercy College	1,2	$539,567	SP, SC, SLP, OT, PT
14.	New York Institute of Technology	2	$139,585	OT, PT
15.	New York University	1,2	$1,096,590	C & G, SLP, SW, OT, PT
16.	NYS Medical College School of Public Health	1,2	$64,029	SLP, PT
17.	Queens College	1	$28,920	SP, SC
18.	SUNY-State University College at Buffalo	1	$25,000	SLP
19.	SUNY Health Science Center at Brooklyn-Downstate Medical Center	2	$45,248	OT
20.	Teachers College, Columbia University	1	$450,000	SLP
21.	Touro College	1,2	$346,012	SP, SLP, OT, PT
22.	Utica College of Syracuse University	2	$25,000	OT, PT

	VENDOR NAME	COMPONENTS	ESTIMATED ANNUAL AMOUNT	DISCIPLINE*
23.	York College	2	$25,000	OT

*Definitions: SE - Special Education
SW - Social Work
SLP - Speech Language Pathology
SC - School Counseling
C &G - Counseling and Guidance
OT - Occupational Therapy
PT - Physical Therapy
BVI - Blind & Visually Impaired

DISCUSSION

Federal and state laws require that students with disabilities, who are evaluated for services, be provided with appropriate instructional and clinical services within an acceptable timeframe.

The New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) continues to experience a shortage of personnel in various areas of special education and related services. To address these staffing needs and to improve the delivery of required services, the NYCDOE has implemented Scholarship Programs in the following areas:

Teaching Disciplines	Clinical Disciplines	Related Services
Bilingual Special Education	Guidance and Counseling	Occupational Therapy
Visually Impaired	School Psychology	Physical Therapy
Speech Language Pathology	School Social Work	

The NYCDOE issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) as an alternative to a Competitive Sealed Bid to allow for evaluation of the qualitative differences among various pedagogical programs. Specifically, the NYCDOE sought evidence that vendors' students complete their degrees timely, as well as comprehensive course offerings. Additionally, the NYCDOE sought evidence of the rate of students who honored their commitment to work for the NYCDOE for the specified time upon graduation.

RFP #R0725 sought graduate and undergraduate colleges and universities offering New York State approved degree programs. The RFP had two components. Component 1 focuses on degree programs designed to prepare students for state certification in teaching and clinical disciplines pertinent to special education. Programs were sought that will develop bilingual specialists, as well as monolingual professionals in the critical shortage areas governed by the Jose P litigation. Proposed programs were required to provide appropriate course work and training for matriculated individuals leading to New York State certification. Such programs include Speech Pathology (Bilingual and Monolingual), Teachers of Bilingual Special Education, the Visually Impaired and the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Additionally, bilingual students are prepared in the areas of School Psychology, School Social Work and School Counseling. Tuition payment would be granted to the selected institutions on behalf of the accepted students. In exchange for a service commitment of two (2) years for each year of tuition paid, the students enrolled would receive a master's degree. Furthermore, participating Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) are required to coordinate recruitment activities with the NYCDOE Division of Human Resources, Office of Scholarship and Incentive Programs. IHE's must actively recruit scholarship candidates and promote the program in appropriate advertising markets.

Component 2 focuses on programs in Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy. These programs would grant tuition payment to institutions offering New York State approved doctoral, masters and bachelor degree programs leading to appropriate New York State Education Department licensure.

Of the twenty-three (23) institutions that submitted proposals, four (4) submitted proposals for both components. These proposals were evaluated by a committee drawn from Human Resources and the Office of Related and Contractual Services. All colleges and universities that submitted a proposal and met the minimum qualifications were awarded to ensure diversity of schools. Although students decide the schools they want to attend, the program offices intend to provide more scholarships to students at schools which were ranked higher.

The Policy and Vendor Performance Unit conducted background checks on those institutions whose contract amount will exceed $1,000,000 over the five year term. The background check for Touro College revealed adverse information. An audit by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) showed Touro College did not fully comply with Title IV institutional and program eligibility requirements. It was recommended that Touro College return the improperly awarded Title IV funds disbursed to students attending ineligible locations, estimated at $53,000,000. Touro did not concur with the audit findings or with the recommendations made. This matter remains unresolved.

Touro is also challenging the findings of a separate audit which revealed that Touro was overpaid over $3,000,000 in Tuition Assistance Program funding. It was recommended that Touro repay funds to Higher Education Services Corporation. The OSC reports that Touro is challenging the findings and the matter is still pending.

Touro College initiated an investigation involving a fraudulent transcript scheme. Touro is cooperating with this investigation.

Based on Touro College's continued actions to resolve the above mentioned matters, and the Department's awareness of each situation, we do not believe these matters should preclude a potential contract award.

There were no significant adverse findings relating to the other vendors. Additionally, the Vendex system did not reveal cautions for those institutions that were not background checked by the Policy and Vendor Performance Unit.

The Cost Price Analysis Unit determined that prices were fair and reasonable for all vendors except one. NYU's proposed rate was 5% higher than its published rate. The university refused the DOE's request to lower its rate and contends that its rate is inflated to offset a 3 year fixed rate as required by the contract. Given the higher cost, the program office will assure that fewer NYU candidates will receive scholarships.

Subsequent RAs will be submitted as additional schools and programs are added. DCP will approve additional vendors as they are deemed qualified based on the evaluation criteria.

AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS FOR SERVICES TO PROMOTE SAFE AND SUPPORTIVE SCHOOL COMMUNITIES FOR THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (RFP 1C609)

General Information:

Funding Source	Terms of Contracts	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?
System-wide Requirements	10/1/07 – 9/30/12	Request for Proposals	No

Vendors	Estimated Annual Amount
Appelbaum Training Institute	$225,000.00
Educators for Social Responsibility (National)	$145,000.00
Educational Treatment Alternatives	$70,000.00
Positive Conflict Management (PCM) Associates	$95,000.00
The Zaccaro Group, LLC	$125,000.00
Peace Games	$70,000.00
Safe Horizon, Inc.	$25,000.00
Groupworks for Education	$557,000.00
Project Adventure, Inc.	$720,000.00
Chrysallis Empowerment & Transformation	$95,000.00
Institute for Labor and the Community	$80,000.00
Operation Respect	$150,000.00
Academy for Educational Development	$80,000.00
LIPEN (Bully Frog Program)	$50,000.00
Washington Heights Inwood Education, Inc.	$85,000.00
Morningside Center	$120,000.00
CUNY – Creative Arts Tea	$325,000.00
Every Person Influences Children (EPIC)	$50,000.00
The Leadership Program	$975,000.00
Learning – Expanded Arts Program	$100,000.00

Anti-Defamation League (ADL)	$150,000.00
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc. (F.E.G.S.)	$50,000.00
The NY Academy of Medicine	$65,000.00
The Brotherhood of Sister Sol	$60,000.00
Ramapo for Children	$97,500.00
The Lesbian, Gay/Transgender Community Center	$65,000.00
Safe & Supportive – Utterly Global, LLC	$50,000.00
Partnership with Children	$115,000.00
Community Counseling and Mediation	$25,000.00
Hospital Audiences, Inc. (HAI)	$60,000.00
Effective Alternative in Reconciliation Services (E.A.R.S.)	$25,000.00
Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Center	$250,000.00
Youth Empowerment Mission	$60,000.00
Center for Social and Emotional Education	$50,000.00
National Urban Technology Center	$60,000.00
GLSEN	$250,000.00
Center for Court Innovation	$50,000.00
Bank Street College Education	$85,000.00
ENACT	$50,000.00
NY Center for Interpersonal Development	$35,000.00
Turn Around	$155,000.00
Creative Response to Conflict	$225,000.00
Life Space Crisis Intervention	$550,000.00

Service Requestor and Contract Information:

Contract Manager:
Connie Cuttle (212) 374-6834

Procurement Officer:
James E. Whitfield (718)-935-5129

Statement of Purpose:
The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into contract with the above listed vendors to provide professional development, parent workshops, and direct services to student and schools in the areas of behavior management, conflict resolution, and other services that promote safe and supportive school communities. The estimated range of costs for these programs are between $35,000 and $970,000 per year over 5 years, or about $4.1 million in total per year to be paid for by the Office of School Youth and Development, Student Support Organizations, and schools.

Narrative:
The Office of School Youth and Development was created to design, coordinate and promote innovative strategies to advance youth development. These strategies cut across all disciplines at the Citywide and individual school levels. The goal is for all New York City children to reach their full potential and become healthy, productive adults through services that promote safe and supportive school communities. The Office of School and Youth Development supports and funds programs and initiatives that enable youth to build on their unique strengths. It supports programs that provide opportunities for youth to gain important life skills and core competencies, and that allow youth to have meaningful roles in their communities. Youth development initiatives benefit young people in their homes, neighborhoods, and schools.

The "Services to Promote Safe and Supportive School Communities" Request for Proposals (RFP) was created as a means to continue and extend the types of services that were originally provided through an expiring RFP (#1C121). The expiring RFP was initiated out of the Office of School Intervention and Development under the leadership of CEO Elayna Konstan. As of July 1, 2007, this Office has merged with the Office of Youth Development and is now the Office of School and Youth Development, which still reports to Elayna Konstan. The intent of this RFP is to select vendors that can continue to provide the schools with services that include behavior management, crisis intervention, anger management, bully prevention, cyber bullying, conflict resolution, and the promotion of respect for diversity.

The above listed vendors were chosen because they will provide schools with the choice of high quality services in professional development in a variety of areas that range from behavior management as well as some parent workshop models. The Evaluation Committee found these proposals and vendors to be acceptable based on the services provided, the effectiveness of the sample lesson plans and their professional presentation of works offered. A background check revealed no adverse information regarding the listed vendors and they are therefore deemed responsible. Historical abstract summary data reveals that similar services provided by awarded vendors, such as New York University, under RFP#1C121 were priced between the ranges of $44.64 to $312.29 per hour for professional development and classroom management workshops. Professional Development workshops are priced hourly through the inclusion of administrative services, material costs, labor overhead, etc. An analysis of the pricing cost and rates offered by these vendors were consistent with the rates for comparable competitively awarded contracts and are therefore considered fair and reasonable.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION (RA)

ARTS EDUCATION SERVICES—R0164—RA#1

Vendor	Estimated Contract Cost per annum	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?
Various	$41,100,000	Various including Tax levy & Reimbursable funds	September 3, 2007 to September 2, 2012 (5-Years)	Pre-Qualified Solicitation	No

	Awarded Vendors	Estimated Annual Amount
1.	American Folk Museum	$50,000
2.	Arts Horizon	$960,000
3.	Ballet Ambassadors, Inc.	$50,000
4.	Battery Dance Company	$50,000
5.	Brooklyn Academy of Music (BAM)	$50,000
6.	Brooklyn Arts Council, Inc.	$350,000
7.	Brooklyn Arts Exchange, Inc.	$85,000
8.	Brooklyn Center for the Urban Environment, Inc.	$50,000
9.	Brooklyn Conservatory of Music	$50,000
10.	Brooklyn Museum of Art	$150,000
11.	Brooklyn Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra	$50,000
12.	Center for Kinesthetic Education	$50,000
13.	CIS Counseling Center, Inc.	$70,000
14.	Community Word Project	$50,000
15.	Creative Outlet Dance Theatre of Brooklyn	$250,000
16.	CUNY/Creative Arts Team	$50,000
17.	Dance Theater Etcetera	$50,000
18.	Dance Theatre of Harlem	$50,000
19.	Dancewave, Inc.	$50,000
20.	Duende Pictures	$100,000

21.	Dream Yard Drama Project Inc.	$730,000
22.	Early Stages Program	$80,000
23.	Education in Dance & The Related Arts	$50,000
24.	Education Through Music, Inc.	$130,000
25.	E. Monte Motion, Inc.	$50,000
26.	Enact, Inc.	$120,000
27.	Epic Theater Center, Inc.	$80,000
28.	Harlem School of the Arts	$350,000
29.	Henry Street Settlement	$360,000
30.	Hospital Audiences, Inc. (HAI)	$250,000
31.	Ifetayo Cultural Arts	$50,000
32.	InCollaboration, Incorporated a/k/a the Readers Theatre Workshop	$160,000
33.	Jazz at Lincoln Center, Inc.	$50,000
34.	Learning Through An Expanded Arts Program, Inc. (LEAP)	$700,000
35.	Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, Inc.	$300,000
36.	Lincoln Center Theater	$50,000
37.	L.I.T.C., Inc.	$50,000
38.	Mark DeGarmo & Dancers/Dynamic Forms, Inc.	$50,000
39.	Manhattan Class Company	$55,000
40.	Manhattan New Music Project	$230,000
41.	Manhattan Theater Club	$85,000
42.	Marquis Studios	$390,000
43.	Midori Foundation, Inc. d/b/a Midori & Friends	$410,000
44.	Multicultural Music Group, Inc.	$165,000
45.	MusArt	$55,000
46.	Museum of Art and Design	$50,000
47.	Museum of Chinese in the Americas (MoCA)	$50,000
48.	Museum of Cultural African Diasporian Arts (MOCADA)	$50,000
49.	Music for Many, Inc.	$510,000
50.	Nai-Ni Chen Dance Company, Inc.	$50,000
51.	National Chorale/National Chorale Council	$200,000
52.	National Dance Institute	$150,000

53.	New Perspectives Theater	$50,000
54.	New York City Center	$50,000
55.	New York City Opera	$50,000
56.	New York Foundation for Architecture	$50,000
57.	Notes in Motion, Inc.	$50,000
58.	Partnering Artists Children Teachers: PACT	$250,000
59.	Pascal Rioult Dance Theatre, Inc.	$50,000
60.	Pentacle Danceworks	$50,000
61.	Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York	$55,000
62.	Planet Arts, Inc.	$50,000
63.	Queens Museum of Art	$50,000
64.	Roundabout Theatre Company	$190,000
65.	Rush Philanthropic Arts Foundation	$100,000
66.	Snug Harbor Cultural Center	$50,000
67.	Society for the Preservation of Weeksville (Weeksville Heritage Center)	$50,000
68.	Society of the Educational Arts, Inc./Sociedad Educativa de las Artes, Inc.	$210,000
69.	Songs of Solomon, Inc.	$200,000
70.	Spanish Dance Arts Company, Inc d/b/a Flamenco Vivo Carlota Santana	$50,000
71.	Stages of Learning	$50,000
72.	Staten Island Children's Museum	$70,000
73.	Symphony Space, Inc.	$110,000
74.	TADA! Theater and Dance Alliance, Inc.	$800,000
75.	The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, Design and Culture	$50,000
76.	The Arts Connection, Inc.	$500,000
77.	The Center for Arts Education	$50,000
78.	The Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center	$50,000
79.	The Children's Art Carnival, Inc.	$50,000
80.	Theater for a New Audience	$50,000
81.	TheatreMoves, Inc.	$110,000
82.	The American Place Theatre-Literature to Live	70,000
83.	The Jewish Museum	$50,000
84.	The Joyce Theater Foundation, Inc.	$50,000

85.	The Metropolitan Opera Guild, Inc.	$140,000
86.	The Museum of Modern Art	$50,000
87.	The New 42nd Street, Inc.	$50,000
88.	The Studio in a School Association, Inc.	$1,180,000
89.	The Shadow Box Theatre, Inc.	$50,000
90.	Together in Dance: Zalesky and Associates	$150,000
91.	Town Hall Foundation, Inc.	$50,000
92.	Whitney Museum of American Art	$50,000
93.	Wingspan Arts, Inc.	$110,000
94.	Working Playground	$300,000
95.	Yeshiva University Museum	$50,000
96.	Young Audiences of New York	$600,000
97.	Young Dancers in Repertory, Inc.	$50,000
98.	Young Playwrights, Inc.	$50,000

Service Requestor/Contract Manager:
Dr. Sharon Dunn, Senior Instructional Manager for Arts Education
Tel: 212-374-6119

Division of Contracts and Purchasing:

Andrea Black, Procurement Analyst
Tel: 718-935-4984

Statement of Purpose:

The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into ninety-eight (98) requirements contracts with the above vendors to provide direct services to students (hereafter referred to as "*Direct Student Services*"), related professional development and planning sessions, and/or direct services to parents (hereafter referred to as "*Parent Services*" for the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE). The goal for this initiative is to enter into contracts with providers who can deliver high quality arts education services to support and advance teaching and learning in the four art forms: Visual Arts, Music, Dance and Theater. These programs would be provided at the discretion of each participating school.

Overview:
A new arts initiative (hereafter referred to as "*ArtsCount*") was announced in July 2007, by Mayor Bloomberg and Chancellor Klein. The formation created will enhance arts education in NYC schools through accountability and quality improvement strategies by building on the Blueprint for the Arts, implemented in 2004. The Blueprint for the Arts and *ArtsCount* share common benchmarks and curriculum goals for each arts discipline: Visual Arts, Music, Dance and Theater. *ArtsCount* incorporates arts metrics into the Administration's measurement of school performance, while the Blueprint provides a complete view of each arts disci-

pline by both subject-based (defining the goals for content) and outcome-based (defining the goals for student achievement) curriculum. Together these programs will establish the first-ever accountability plan for arts programming, while signaling the importance of art to a student's overall education.

The Office of Arts and Special Projects, in collaboration with the Division of Teaching and Learning (T&L), sought proposals from qualified organizations to provide the required direct student services which may include related professional development and planning sessions and/or parent services for NYC schools. The core function of these programs is to create resources for schools to share best practices in developing effective arts programs. Exemplary services should encompass the guidelines set forth in the Blueprint for the Arts, while adding depth and dimension to studies in other disciplines.

A Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS) was released and one hundred and thirty (130) proposals were received. The Evaluation Committee was drawn from the Office of Arts and Special Projects, Regional Arts Supervisors, School-Based Administrators and Teachers both active and retired. Proposals were evaluated and scored based on the following evaluation criteria: Program Plan (30 points), Organizational Capacity (30 points), Demonstrated Effectiveness (20 points) and Price (20 points). Members of the Evaluation Committee were sub-divided into 3-member groups to evaluate proposals. Out of these groups, a steering committee was formed to standardize the scores received by the committee. The steering committee comprised of a liaison from the Office of Arts and Special Projects, a Teacher of Dance and a Retired Teacher all familiar with the Arts initiatives set forth in the Blueprint. In order to gauge the scores received by the evaluation committee, the steering committee read approximately 95% of the proposals received. To ensure scoring consistency, a training session was conducted for all readers where they received an overview of the evaluation process and a scoring rubric, using the chart below:

Total Maximum Score 30 points		Total Maximum Score 20 points
0-9	Not Acceptable	0-5
10-16	Marginally Acceptable	6-11
17-25	Acceptable	12-15
26-30	Exceptional	16-20

The evaluation form also contained benchmarks for each service criteria. After deliberation, a standard score of 75% was set as the basis for contract award. Initially, 75 proposals received scores of 75% or above, 27 proposals received scores under 75% and 26 proposals were deemed anomalies *(1 out of the 3 scores fell under 75%)* and were re-read. The results of the re-read increased the numbers for contract award to 98 and the proposals receiving scores under 75% may re-submit at a later date. 2 proposals, Bindlestiff Family Variety Arts and Orchestra of St. Luke did not provide the necessary documents for evaluation and thus will not be considered at this time.

Ninety-eight (98) providers were recommended for contract award by the evaluation committee, contingent upon background investigation. Down-selected Proposers (See, Appendix A attached) will be notified of the deficiencies in their proposal and will be allowed to resubmit at a later date.

Background checks were conducted for the 98 vendors listed and no significant adverse information was revealed found. Thus, all are deemed responsible.

Pricing for arts services varies depending on the rates associated with each program proposed. Nearly all vendors selected for award under this new procurement had previous contracts with the DOE. Understanding the nature of these services the awarded vendor's hourly rates were analyzed and common workshops such as theatre/assembly performance, dance ensemble, museum lectures and arts event/museum trips were categorized to establish a standard rate. It was found that hourly rates had either not changed whatsoever or had increased slightly, which is reasonable considering the prior contract pricing is three years old. The newly proposed rates were consistently found to be fair and reasonable across the NYC Arts Community.

The estimated annual amount for each awarded vendor was based on prior year utilization data from FAMIS. For vendors new to the system, estimated annual amount was based on discussions with the program owner and vendor availability to perform service.

Future RAs for these services will be submitted in batches as new providers are presented for an award. Proposals will be evaluated within a reasonable time (up to sixty days) taken from the date stamp on the proposal. Vendors will be recommended if they meet the same evaluation score of 75 points.

Appendix A

The rationale for the 30 vendor's down-select decisions is provided in the chart below.

Vendor's Name	Justification for Down-Select
The T.I.M.M.E Company, Inc.	Proposal lacks clarity as to how they will provide the requested services.
Suparc Enterprises, Inc.	The proposed workshops were vague and the programmatic plan may not be worthwhile for NYC schools.
Puppetry in Practice	Proposal does not provide evidence on the proposed program's effectiveness. Programs are more inline with literacy, ESL and Math services.
Miller School of Dance	Proposal lacks evidence that it can deliver the services detailed in the Arts PQS.
Professional Development Literary Pathways (PDLP)	Proposal is not clear as to how the programs will be implemented and whether they can fulfill the Blueprint curriculum. Proposal markets art products for sale.
Martha Graham School of Contemporary Dance, Inc.	The standards set forth in the Blueprint are not evidenced in the proposed programs.
Long Island Children's Museum	Proposal does not address the Blueprint or how they can help schools fulfill the teaching of their arts curriculum.
Kupferberg Center Performances	Proposal failed to address the needs set forth in the Arts PQS. Uncertain whether vendor is capable of providing quality face-to-face direct student services to NYC students.
Irondale Productions, Inc.	Proposal does not contain clear description of programs as requested by the Arts PQS.
INSPIRIT, a dance company, Inc.	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the Arts PQS. Limited information was provided concerning the effectiveness of the program.
Family Life Theatre Programs	The proposal acknowledges the Blueprint, but does not specifically discuss how their program will connect to the Blueprint.
Episcopal Social Services	There is no evidence that Proposer is knowledgeable regarding the delivery of the Arts as it pertains to the Blueprint.
SCO Family of Services	Proposal emphasis is on building social skills and art training appears secondary. Proposer did not provide resumes nor a program plan for the subcontractor who will provide arts education services.
Djembefola Dance & Drum	Proposer may not have the capacity to serve NYC schools. Further Blueprint training is needed.
Doing Art Together, Inc.	Proposal does not address the needs outlined in the Arts PQS. Proposal did not provide sufficient description of the proposed services.
Batoto Yetu, Inc.	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the Arts PQS. Proposal needed more specific information regarding their

	workshops and residencies services.
The Anne Frank Center USA, Inc.	Proposal submitted focuses on social studies curriculum rather than arts education programs.
World Dance Theatre	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the Arts PQS. Proposed programs lack flexibility in length and/or duration of residency programming.
Whitehorse Productions	Proposal submitted focuses more on social studies curriculum rather than arts education programs.
Urban Word	Proposed program does not reflect the Arts Education agenda. It is more geared towards enrichment services.
The Digital Project	Proposal does not show evidence that it can fulfill a commitment to the average NYC DOE school.
Tech4Learning, Inc.	The proposed computer program, although indicating clay animation, does not indicate any understanding of arts instruction.
The Right Choices Enterprise, Inc.	Proposal did not provide evidence that their organization can fulfill a commitment to the average NYC DOE school.
World Foundation for Music and Healing	There is no direct indication of how this program aligns with NYS Learning Standards or the Blueprints for the Arts.
Art in History, Inc.	Proposal does not address the needs outlined the Arts PQS. Vendor sells "art kits".
Afro-Heritage Venture	Proposal lacks evidence that it can deliver the requests detailed in the Arts PQS.
Academic Entertainment, Inc.	Proposal does not address the needs outlined in the Arts PQS. Proposal does not reflect on-going programs but offers an ad kit for promotional information.
Richmond Dance Ensemble, Inc.	Proposal does not address the needs outlined in the Arts PQS. Proposed program not structured for Arts Education but more of an entertainment venue for children.
Rhonda Cates Dance & Theatrical Company	Proposal lacks evidence that it can deliver the requests detailed in the Arts PQS. The proposal submitted is unclear as to what will be offered to the schools as it pertains to Arts Education.
Jazz Reach	Proposal lacks evidence of direct student participation.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION

To add vendors to provide Career and Technical Education services under PQS# R0056.

Estimated Contract Cost	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$630,000	Reimbursable Funds and Tax Levy	3 years starting on or about 12/1/09, with two one year options to extend until 8/31/14	Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS) #R0056	No	Requirements

Vendors	Component Services	Estimated Annual Amount
National Academy Foundation	**A**	**$150,000**
USA Today	**A**	**$60,000**

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact
Greg Betheil	Stephen Stamo
Senior Executive, Career and Technical Education	Division of Contracts and Purchasing
212-374-0465	718-935-2254

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Chancellor's approval is sought to contract with the vendor listed above to provide career and technical education services and related products to selected high schools. Two (2) previous RAs under PQS# R0056 were approved by the Chancellor, recommending 9 vendors for contract award. This RA will add two (2) requirements contracts. The term of these contracts will be three (3) years, beginning on or about December 1, 2009 with options to extend for two additional one-year periods. The estimated annual total is $210,000.

DISCUSSION

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 provides federal funds for Vocational and Adult Education. There are 330 Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs offered in 125 high schools citywide. These contracts will be funded primarily by federal sources (85%) and tax levy funds (15%) will supplement any shortfall. We anticipate receiving approximately $14,820,000 annually from Carl D. Perkins funds. The remaining CTE allocated funds go to the schools directly. The estimated annual expenditure for these vendors is $210,000. This estimate is based on demonstrated school demand for these vendors' services.

The PQS was divided into the following eight components:
(A) Professional Development/Curriculum Integration
(B) Curriculum Enrichment/Certification Curricula
(C) School/Business Partnership Development
(D) Development of Business/Industry Technical Assessments for Testing/Evaluation,
(E) Technical Training and Certification Software, Software, Materials and Teacher Resources
(F) Instructional Manuals, Materials, and Related Instructional Software Devices required by CTE Schools and Programs to Maintain Industry Standards; (this component contains consumable materials, instructional software devices and instructional materials including curricula and student manuals relating to the software);
(G) CTE Teacher Preparation and Licensure
(H) CTE Website Development

Proposals were scored using the following Evaluation Criteria: Program Design (25 points), Organizational Capacity (25 points), Demonstrated Effectiveness (25 points) and Price (25 points). The three member evaluation committee consisted of representatives from the Office of Secondary Schools and various Learning Support Centers. All vendors were required to meet a minimum evaluation score of eighty (80) points in order to comply with the standards recommended by the PQS process.

Vendors were able to propose for one or multiple components. The awarded vendors submitted only under Component A. National Academy Foundation will provide professional development to teachers and administrators in the area of integration of academic and career technical education instruction to strengthen CTE student achievement. USA Today will provide professional development in reading strategies with emphasis on reference and research skills.

The Policy and Vendor Performance Unit conducted background checks for both National Academy Foundation and USA Today, which revealed no significant adverse findings.

The Cost Price Analysis Unit determined that the prices were fair and reasonable for both vendors when compared with DOE contracts for similar programs offered.

The selected vendors will be added into the Multiple Task Award Contract (MTAC) system for use by schools. We expect that over time more vendors will be selected though the PQS process and included in the qualified pool of vendors.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION (RA)

ENRICHMENT SERVICES—R0084—RA#1

Vendor	Estimated Contract Cost per annum	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?
Various	$5,000,000	Various, including Tax levy & Reimbursable funds	September 1, 2007 to August 31, 2012 (5-Years)	Pre-Qualified Solicitation	No

Awarded Vendors	Estimated Annual Amount
Kaplan Inc., action through its Kaplan K12 Learning Services Division	$280,000
New York Junior Tennis League	$180,000
Learning through an Expanded Arts Program Inc. (LEAP)	$350,000
MIS KIDS Inc. d/b/a/ FutureKids	$230,000
The Knowledge Project	$80,000
Sports & Arts in Schools Foundation	$700,000
Harlem Children's Zone, Inc.	$70,000
Trail Blazer Camps	$50,000
Working Playground, Inc.	$60,000
New York City Outward Bound Center, Inc.	$250,000
Brooklyn Center for the Urban Environment, Inc.	$410,000
OASIS Children's Services	$1,005,000
Vision Education Media	$50,000
PACT: Partnering Artists Children Teachers	65,000
Roundabout Theatre Company	$50,000
Partnership with Children, Inc.	$95,000
The Children's Aid Society	$195,000
Hospital Audiences, Inc.	$50,000
The ArtsConnection, Inc.	$50,000
Young Audiences New York	$50,000
Knowledge Learning Corporation	$60,000

Project Reach Youth, Inc. (PRY)	$95,000
S & L Consultants	$60,000
Literacy Inc.	$50,000
The B.E.L.L Foundation, Inc.	$100,000
Young Playwrights, Inc.	$50,000

Service Requestor/Contract Manager:
Veronica Conforme, Deputy Chief Executive Officer for Empowerment Schools
Tel: 212-374-6861

Division of Contracts and Purchasing:

Andrea Black, Procurement Analyst
Tel: 718-935-4984

Statement of Purpose:

The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into twenty-six (26) requirements contracts to provide supplemental enrichment programs (hereafter "SEP") for the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE). The goal of SEP is to foster student creativity, while providing motivational opportunities which include, building self-esteem, encouraging academic achievement, developing interpersonal and motor skills, learning responsibility and accountability, interacting with diverse cultures, improving student attendance, and providing students with positive mentors. These programs would be selected at the discretion of each participating school.

Discussion:
In support of the Chancellor's initiative to reorganize school governance and enhance the delivery of quality instruction, the Office of Empowerment Schools (OES), in collaboration with the Division of Teaching and Learning (T&L), sought proposals from qualified organizations to provide enrichment services for NYC DOE schools. The ultimate goal for these programs is to promote the integration of recreational and enrichment programming with academic studies. Providers were encouraged to develop tailored implementation models and flexible programming that would meet both school and student needs.

A Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS) was advertised and thirty-nine (39) proposals were received. The evaluation committee was drawn from the Office of Special Projects, Empowerment Schools, and the Integrated Service Centers. Proposals were evaluated and scored based on the following evaluation criteria: Program Plan (30 points), Organizational Capacity (30 points), Demonstrated Effectiveness (20 points) and Price (20 points). The evaluation committee was sub-divided into 4-groups of 3-members each. Subgroups were given the same proposals to read. To ensure consistency, a training session was conducted for all readers where they received an overview of the evaluation process and a scoring rubric, using the chart below:

Total Maximum Score 30 points		Total Maximum Score 20 points

0-9	Not Acceptable	0-5
10-16	Marginally Acceptable	6-11
17-25	Acceptable	12-15
26-30	Exceptional	16-20

The evaluation form also contained benchmarks for each service criteria. After deliberation, the evaluation committee set a standard score of 70% as the basis for contract award. 20 proposals received scores of 70% or above. 8 proposals received scores under 70% and 10 proposals were deemed anomalies *(1 out of the 3 scores fell under 70%)* and were re-read. Of the 10 anomalies, 6 received scores above 70% and the remaining 4 were not recommended for award. Please refer to the chart below:

	# of Vendors	# of Reads @ </>70%	Award Determination
1.	20 Vendors	3 @ <70%	Award
2.	8 Vendors	3 @ >70%	No award, Vendors may re-propose
3.	10 Vendors (anomalies)	2 @ <70%	Performed 4th Read
3A.	→6 Vendors	3 @ <70%	Award
3B.	→4 Vendors	2 @ >70%	No award, Vendors may re-propose

The rationale for all down-select decisions is provided in the chart below.

Vendor's Name	Justification for Down-Select
TheatreMoves, Inc.	Proposal not suitable for enrichment services.
Camp Vacamas	Proposal lacks Staffing and does not provide a year-round support schedule. Evaluator raised concerns regarding past criminal history.
Henkels & McCoy	Proposal was weak in response to the overall service request.
USA Today	Provision of objective data not easily apparent and self esteem development area weak.
Career Corner TV	Proposal not suitable for enrichment services.
ChaRosa Foundation Co.	Proposal failed to demonstrate successful outcomes, they offer contracts as evidence. No program structures describe and entirely unclear as to who is slated for each position.
Intrepid Sea Air	Proposal was weak in response to the

and Space Museum	overall service request, Proposer offering one shot events.
Happy Dragon of New York	Proposal reads as a standard preschool program and not a supplementary enrichment program.
SUPARC Enterprises	Proposal was weak in response to the overall service request.
Light & Love Productions	Proposal was weak in response to the overall service request.
Breakthrough to Literacy	Withdrew. Proposal did not reflect the requested services, but provided access to purchase the Vendor's products.
Mad Science of Westchester	Proposal was weak in response to the overall service request.
Education in Dance & The Related Arts	Proposal was weak in response to the overall service request.

Twenty-six (26) providers were recommended for contract award by the evaluation committee, contingent upon background investigation. Down-selected Proposers will be notified of the deficiencies in their proposal and will be allowed to resubmit at a later date.

Background checks were conducted for the 26 vendors listed and no significant adverse information was revealed. Thus, all are deemed responsible.

Based on utilization reports of prior year activity, nearly all spend on these contracts will be in the form of hourly workshops, including half day, full day or after school. Understanding this dynamic, the awarded vendor's hourly rate for a workshop was calculated and was used to establish a price range of $350 to $400. This cost range was then compared to the hourly rates from the prior contract for the same enrichment services, calendar years 2004-2007. Since nearly all the vendors selected for award under this new procurement had a contract from the previous procurement, a comparison of hourly rates was performed. It was found that hourly rates had either not changed whatsoever or had increased slightly, which is reasonable considering the prior contract pricing is four years old. Also, hourly workshop rates from the just completed PQS for Student Support Services (wherein 150 awards are being made) also fall within a $350 to $400 hourly range; further demonstrating price is fair and reasonable.

The estimated annual amount for each awarded vendor was based on prior year utilization data from FAMIS. For vendors new to the system, estimated annual amount was based on discussions with the program client and vendor availability to perform service. See chart above for estimated value by vendor.

Future RAs for these services will be submitted in batches new providers are presented for an award. Proposals will be evaluated within a reasonable time (up to sixty days) taken from the date stamp on the proposal. Vendors will be recommended if they meet the same evaluation score of 70 points.

AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO REQUIREMENT CONTRACTS WITH PROVIDERS OF

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR SCHOOL LEADERS AND TEACHERS (PQS R0328)

Contract Cost	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method
$2,500,000	Tax Levy and Reimbursable Funds	September 1, 2008 to August 31, 2013 (5-Years)	Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS)
See Appendix A for the list of vendors.			

Contract Manager:
Winifred M. Radigan, Executive Officer for Instruction – ICI LSO
Tel. 718-557-2624

Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact:
Shenise Elliott
Tel. 718-935-2254

Statement of Purpose:
The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into requirements contracts with 41 vendors of professional development services for school teachers and leaders. These vendors provide professional development services for educators in brain-based instructional strategies, student-centered academic counseling services, sustainable leadership, quality teaching and student achievement in NYC schools. Contracts will be utilized on an as needed basis by all DOE schools.

Discussion:
A solicitation for Professional Development for School Teachers and Leaders was released as a PQS in March 2008 seeking vendors with proven expertise in brain-based instructional strategies. Brain-based Instructional strategies are based on research on the effects of different teaching strategies on scientifically measured neurological indicators. Vendors will offer instruction to principals, coaches and teachers on the use of these strategies to improve student retention, knowledge transfer, motivation and degree of progress.

The evaluation committee, scoring in the categories of Program Plan (30 points), Organizational Capacity (30 points), Pricing (25 points) and Demonstrated Effectiveness (15 points), recommended 41 out of 46 vendors for contract award. Successful vendors had to achieve a minimum score of 70.

Pricing was compared with other contracted professional development vendors providing similar services and was found to be consistent. DCP checked the VENDEX database, the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) and Federal Tax Lien database, and the federal Excluded Parties List System (EPLS). No adverse information was revealed.

At DCP's request, the Integrated Curriculum and Instruction (ICI) Learning Support Organization (LSO) agreed to represent all LSOs for this procurement. ICI-LSO estimates a spend of $600,000 for the 370 schools within it. DCP estimates a total spend of $2.5M for approximately 1500 schools (the entire NYCDOE school-system) on the basis of ICI-LSO's estimation for 370 schools. Since these are all new contracts, we have no basis for estimating them at different levels of spend, and use the average figure of $61,000 for each one.

As a part of the PQS process, all service requests over $25,000 must go through the Multiple Task Award Contract (MTAC) 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 awarded areas. Vendors will be required to provide proposals and pricing based on their contracted services which will be evaluated and scored. Upon completion of this mini-

solicitation process, schools will secure services via a Purchase Order (PO). This process ensures competition among the largest number of vendors eligible to provide service as a result of this procurement.

The PQS process allows ongoing proposal submission by vendors. Additional RAs will be submitted as new proposals are recommended for contract award by the evaluation committee.

Approved:

_____ Date:_____

David N. Ross
Executive Director
Division of Contracts and Purchasing

Appendix A

	Awarded Vendor	Estimated Annual Amount		Awarded Vendor	Estimated Annual Amount
1	Ann Shannon, Ph.D 4344 Fruitvale Avenue, Oakland, CA 94602	$61,000	14	The Interactive Class, Inc. (b) 27 Siebrecht Place, New Rochelle, NY 10804	$61,000
2	The Riesling Group Inc., dba CE Credits Online 15914 232nd Ave. NE, Woodinville, WA 98077	$61,000	15	American Reading Company / 100 Book Challenge 201 South Gulph Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406	$61,000
3	Center Source Systems 7975 Cameron Drive, Ste. 500, Windor, CA 95492	$61,000	16	ASCD 1703 N. Beauregard St., Alexandria, VA 22311	$61,000
4	Institute for Student Achievement One Hollow Lane, Ste. 100, Lake Success, NY 11042	$61,000	17	Successful Learning Group, Inc. 7 Bill Place, Rm.2, Brooklyn, NY 11218	$61,000
5	American Institutes for Research 1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW, Washington, DC 20007	$61,000	18	Catapult Learning, LLC. 470 N. 2nd St., 2nd fl., Philadelphia, PA 19123	$61,000
6	Success for All Foundation, Inc. 200 West Towsonton Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21204	$61,000	19	Educational Video Center 120 West 30th St.,7th fl., New York, NY 10001	$61,000
7	NCS Pearson, Inc. 3075 W. Ray Road, Ste. 200, Chandler, AZ 85226	$61,000	20	NYC Writing Project 250 Bedford Park Boulevard West, Rm.116, Bronx, NY 10468	$61,000
8	Heart of Change Associates 8632 Brair Patch, Baldwinsville, NY 13027	$61,000	21	NYC Mathematics Project 250 Bedford Park Boulevard West, Rm.116, Bronx, NY 10468	$61,000
9	Mondo Publishing 980 Avenue of the Americas, 2nd, New York, NY 10018	$61,000	22	Center for Integrated Teacher Education 255 Executive Drive, Ste.400, Plainview, NY 11803	$61,000
10	Ventures Education Systems 15 Maiden Lane, Ste. 200, New York, NY10038	$61,000	23	Kaplan 1 Liberty Plaza, 22nd fl., New York, NY 10006	$61,000
11	HMH Supplemental / Rigby Professional Development 181 Ballardvale St., Wilmington, MA 01887	$61,000	24	Teaching Matters, Inc. 475 Riverside Drive, Ste.1270, New York, NY 10115	$61,000
12	ETA/Cuisenaire 500 Greenview Court, Vernon Hills, IL 60061	$61,000	25	Bank Street College 610 112th Street, New York, NY 10025	$61,000
13	Cambridge Education, LLC. 22 Bleeker Street, Millburn, NJ 07041	$61,000	26	Teachers College Reading and Writing Project P.O. Box 77 Teachers College 525 West 120th Street – Thorndike, 8th fl. New York, NY 10027	$61,000

	Awarded Vendor	Estimated Annual Amount		Awarded Vendor	Estimated Annual Amount
27	Creative Learning Press (dba Creative Workshops Associates) P.O. Box 320, Mansfield Center, CT 06520	$61,000	35	CUNY/Creative Arts Team 101 West 31st Street, 6th fl., New York, NY 10001	$61,000
28	Australian and United States Services in Education 352 Seventh Ave, Ste. 12A, New York, NY 10001	$61,000	36	America's Choice, Inc. 555 13th, NW, Rm. 500 West, Washington, DC 20004	$61,000
29	Wide World-Harvard Graduate School of Education 50 Church St., 4th fl., Cambridge, MA 02138	$61,000	37	Performance Learning Systems, Inc. 1150 Glenlivet Drive, Ste. B-24, Allentown, PA 18106	$61,000
30	Brienza Academic Advantage 1762 Benson Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11214	$61,000	38	New York University 665 Broadway, Ste. 801, New York, NY 10012	$61,000
31	Ken Browne Prod. 27 W. 20th Street Ste. 304A, New York, NY 10011	$61,000	39	Voyager Expanded Learning 1800 Valley View Lane, Ste. 400, Dallas, Texas 75234	$61,000
32	Doris Dillon Center d/b/a TC Innovations 2090 Adam Clayton Powell. Jr. Blvd., 8th Fl., New York, NY 10027	$61,000	40	Schoolwide, Inc.. 65 Orville Drive, Bohemia, NY 11716	$61,000
33	The Research Foundation of CUNY 230 W.41st St., New York, NY 10036	$61,000	41	Manhattan Edit Workshop 80 Fifth Avenue, Ste.1501, New York, NY 10011	$61,000
34	David A. Levine 34 Bone Hollow Road, Accord, NY 12404	$61,000			

AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS FOR THE PROVISION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR ARTS EDUCATION FOR THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (PQS #R0089) ~RA#1

Estimated Contract Cost per annum	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$10,000,000	Various including Tax levy & Reimbursable funds	November 1, 2008 to October 31, 2013 (5-Years)	Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS)	No	Requirements
Vendor Name & Address	**See Table Below**				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts and Purchasing
Paul King, interim acting Senior Instructional Manager for Arts Education	Andrea Black, Procurement Contract Manager
Office of Arts and Special Project (OASP)	Division of Contracts and Purchasing (DCP)
Tel: 212-374-0290	Tel: 718-935-4984

Statement of Purpose

The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into requirements contracts with twenty-three (23) vendors to provide professional development services for arts education. The department will partner with organizations and/or individuals that can provide services in one or more of the following component areas: Component #1- Blueprint Trainers, Component #2- Standards-Based Professional Development, and Component #3- Instructional Planning and Support Services. These programs would be provided at the discretion of each participating school.

Discussion

The goal for this initiative is to enter into contracts with providers who can deliver high quality professional development and consultancy services for arts education to support and advance teaching and learning. As an essential priority of the Children's First agenda, professional development and consultancy service providers will collaborate with schools to utilize the Blueprints for Teaching and Learning in the Arts ("Blueprint") to maximum effectiveness, as well as to assist schools in providing content-rich arts learning as required by the New York State Learning standards for arts education.

Blueprint trainers and providers of standards-based professional development will work with schools to enhance teaching and learning in one or more of the following art forms: Visual Arts, Music, Dance, Theater and/or Film and New Media. Providers of instructional planning and support services will consult with school leaders in the areas of facilities, budgeting, planning, and scheduling for arts education as well as in the areas of assessment and evaluation.

A Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS) was released and thirty-six (36) proposals were received. The Evaluation Committee was drawn from OASP Arts Directors, Directors of Arts Accountability and Support, one Principal Assigned, and the Coordinator of Theater Programs. Members of the Evaluation Committee are experts in their respective discipline and conduct citywide professional development workshops. OASP Arts Directors wrote the scope and sequence for the requested services outlined in this solicitation. Proposals were evaluated and scored based on the following evaluation criteria: Program Plan (25 points), Organizational Capacity (25 points), Demonstrated Effectiveness (25 points) and Price (25 points). Successful vendors had to achieve a minimum score of 75. Providers proposing for more than one component were evaluated separately for each component. To ensure scoring consistency, a mandatory training session outlining DCP's procurement process was conducted for committee members.

Twenty-three (23) providers were recommended for contract award by the evaluation committee, contingent upon background investigations. Down-selected proposers will be notified of the deficiencies in their proposal and will be allowed to resubmit at a later date.

The estimated annual amount for each previously contracted vendor was based on the following factors: discussions with the program manager, vendors' availability to perform service and prior years' utilization. It was agreed that vendors new to the system should be allocated a base amount of $50,000.

Pricing varies with each program, but most of the twenty-three (23) vendors had previous professional development contracts. Hourly rates were analyzed and either had not changed or had increased slightly, which is reasonable considering the prior contract pricing is three years old. The newly proposed rates were found to be fair and reasonable based on comparable rates charged by similar providers. Blueprint Trainers' (Component #1) may provide up to 125 hours per annum at an hourly rate of $75 per trainer. Because this is a new service classification, a Blueprint Trainer estimate will be set at $50,000.

As a part of the PQS process, all service requests over $25,000 must go through the Multiple Task Award Contract (MTAC) 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 awarded areas. Vendors will be required to provide a scope 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 (PO). This process is to ensure competition among the large number of vendors eligible to provide service as a result of this procurement. The PQS process allows ongoing proposal submission by vendors. Future RAs for these services will be submitted in batches as new providers are presented for an award.

	Awarded Vendors	Certified Blueprint Trainers	Component(s)	Estimated Annual Amount
	Component #1: Blueprint Trainers			
1.	Michael Mao 104 West 70th Street, New York, New York 10023	**Michael Mao**	**1**	**$50,000**
2.	Together in Dance 66 Genesee Avenue, Teaneck, New Jersey 07666	**Roslyn Biskin, Margot Faught, and Karen Curlee**	**1**	**$50,000**
3.	Mark DeGarmo & Dancers/Dynamic Forms, Inc. 107 Suffolk Street, Suite 310, New York, New York 10002	**Mark DeGarmo**	**1**	**$50,000**
4.	Ballet Theatre Foundation LTD. 890 Broadway, 3rd Floor, New York, New York 10003	**Richard Toda**	**1**	**$50,000**
5.	Tina Curran 465 E. 16th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11226	**Tina Curran**	**1**	**$50,000**
6.	TheatreMoves, Inc. 275 East 7th Street, Suite #4, New York, New York 10009	**Paul Rajeckas**	**1**	**$50,000**
7.	Symphony Space, Inc. 2537 Broadway, New York, New York 10025	**Madeline Cohen**	**1**	**$50,000**
8.	The Arts Connection, Inc. 520 Eighth Avenue, Suite 321, New York, New York 10018	**Jessica Nicoll (Dance), Joanna Hefferen (Theater)**	**1**	**$50,000**
9.	Stages of Learning 138 South Oxford Street, Room Number 1B, Brooklyn, New York 11217	**Floyd Rumohr (Theater), Andrea Seigel (Theater)**	**1**	**$50,000**
10.	American Place Theatre, Inc. 266 West 37th Street, Floor 22, New York, New York 10018	**David Kener**	**1**	**$50,000**

11.	Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York 132 West 65th Street, New York, New York 10023	**Theodore Wiprud**	**1**	**$50,000**
12.	The Studio in a School Association 410 West 59th Street, New York, New York 10019	**The Studio in a School Association (approved for Visual Arts Only)**	**1**	**$50,000**
13.	Theater for a New Audience 154 Christopher Street, Suite 3D, New York, New York 10014	**Joseph Giardina**	**1**	**$50,000**
	Component #2: Standards-Based Professional Development **Component #3: Instructional Planning and Support Services**			
1.	The Metropolitan Opera Guild, Inc. 70 Lincoln Center Plaza, 6th Floor, New York, New York 10023	**N/A**[1]	**2**	**$200,000**
2.	Together in Dance 66 Genesee Avenue, Teaneck, New Jersey 07666	**N/A**	**2**	**$90,000**
3.	Mark DeGarmo & Dancers/Dynamic Forms, Inc. 107 Suffolk Street, Suite 310, New York, New York 10002 **(Dance only)**	**N/A**	**2**	**$140,000**
4.	Magic Box Productions, Inc. 274 Bedford Road, Pleasantville, New York 10570	**N/A**	**2**	**$50,000**
5.	CUNY Creative Arts Team 101 West 31st Street, 6th Floor, New York, New York 10001	**N/A**	**2**	**$100,000**
6.	National Chorale/National Choral Council 1650 Broadway, Suite 301, New York, New York 10019	**N/A**	**2**	**$60,000**
7.	Arts Horizons, Inc. 1 Grand Avenue, Suite #7, Englewood, New Jersey 07631	**N/A**	**2**	**$160,000**

[1] N/A--Not applicable

8.	The Arts Connection, Inc. 520 Eighth Avenue, Suite 321, New York, New York 10018	N/A	2	$150,000
9.	Stages of Learning 138 South Oxford Street, Room Number 1B, Brooklyn, New York 11217	N/A	2,3	$250,000
10.	American Place Theatre, Inc. 266 West 37th Street, Floor 22, New York, New York 10018	N/A	2	$50,000
11.	Learning Through An Expanded Arts Program, Inc. (LEAP) 441 West End Avenue, Room Number 2G, New York, New York 10025	N/A	2	$150,000
12.	J. Brodsky & Associates Educational Consultants, Inc. 522 Shore Road, Room Number 5G, Long Beach, New York 11561	N/A	3	$50,000
13.	Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts 70 Lincoln Center Plaza, New York, New York 10023	N/A	2	$380,000
14.	The Studio in a School Association 410 West 59th Street, New York, New York 10019	N/A	2	$250,000
15.	Brooklyn Academy of Music 30 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, New York 11217	N/A	2 (Dance, Theater, and Film only)	$150,000
16.	Young Playwrights, Inc. 431 Fifth Avenue, 6th Floor, New York, New York 10016	N/A	2	$200,000
17.	Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York 132 West 65th Street, New York, New York 10023	N/A	2	$65,000
18.	Theater for a New Audience 154 Christopher Street, Suite 3D, New York, New York 10014	N/A	2	$50,000

The rationale for the 16 vendor's down-select decisions is provided in the chart below.

	Vendor's Name	Justification for Down-Select
1.	Manhattan New Music Project	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
2.	Notes in Motion	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
3.	Planet Arts	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
4.	New Museum of Contemporary Art	Vendor proposed to the wrong solicitation-transferred proposals to PQS #R0164 Arts Education Services.
5.	City of Lights Youth Theater	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
6.	Together in Dance	Proposal was not approved for Component #3.
7.	The Center for Arts and Education	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
8.	Mark DeGarmo & Dancers	Proposal was not approved for Component #3.
9.	Judith Shakespeare Company	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
10.	SPECTRUM	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
11.	Manhattan Class Theater	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS. Programs proposed are covered by another contract.
12.	Symphony Space	Proposal was not approved for Component #2.
13.	Rush Philanthropic Arts Foundation	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
14.	Cohen Arts & Education	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
15.	Brooklyn Arts Council	Proposal fails to address the needs set forth in the PQS.
16.	CUNY Creative Arts Team	Proposal was not approved for Component #3.

AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS FOR THE PROVISION OF ARTS EDUCATION SERVICES FOR THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (PQS #R0164) ~RA#3

Estimated Contract Cost per annum	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procure-ment Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$2,300,000	Various including Tax levy & Reimburs-able funds	December 1, 2008 to November 30, 2013 (5-Years)	Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS)	No	Requirements
Vendor Name & Address	**See Table Below**				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts and Purchasing
Paul King, Interim acting Senior Instructional Manager for Arts Education	Andrea Black, Procurement Contract Manager
Office of Arts and Special Project	Division of Contracts and Purchasing (DCP)
Tel: 212-374-0290	Tel: 718-935-4984

Statement of Purpose

The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into requirements contracts with seventeen (17) vendors to provide direct services to students, related professional development and planning sessions, and/or direct services to parents. These programs would be provided at the discretion of each participating school.

Two (2) previous RAs for Arts Education Services were approved by the Chancellor, recommending a total of 116 vendors for contract award.

Discussion

The goal for this initiative is to enter into contracts with providers who can deliver high quality arts education services to support and advance teaching and learning in the four art forms: Visual Arts, Music, Dance and Theater. Proposals were read and evaluated by committees chaired by Directors from the Office of Arts and Special Projects.

DCP receives and distributes proposals for arts education services on an on-going basis. One of the four (4) standing committees (Theater, Visual Arts, Music, and Dance) evaluate each proposal. The seventeen (17) providers included in this RA were recommended for contract award by the applicable evaluation committee, contingent upon background investigations. Down-selected Proposers will be notified of the deficiencies in their proposal and will be allowed to resubmit at a later date.

The estimated annual amount for each awarded vendor was based on prior year utilization. For vendors new to the system, the estimated annual amount was based on discussions with the program owner and the vendors' availability to perform service.

DCP conducted background checks for Vendors whose estimated contract amounts did not exceed $1 million dollars and no significant adverse information was revealed. Thus, those Vendors are deemed responsible. Currently, DCP is conducting background checks for the following Vendors whose estimated contract amounts exceed $1 million dollars: Alvin Ailey Dance Foundation, Inc., Ballet Theatre Foundation, Inc., Society of the Third Street Music School Settlement, Inc., Making Books Sing, and Sundog Theatre, Inc. Any adverse findings will result in an amendment to this RA.

Pricing for arts services varies depending on the rates associated with each program proposed. Nearly all vendors selected for award under this new procurement had previous contracts with the DOE. Understanding the nature of these services, the awarded vendor's hourly rates were analyzed and common workshops such as theatre/assembly performance, dance ensemble, museum lectures and arts event/museum trips were categorized for comparison. It was found that hourly rates had either not changed whatsoever or had increased slightly, which is reasonable considering the prior contract pricing is three years old. The newly proposed rates were found to be fair and reasonable based on comparison with rates charged by similar providers.

As a part of the PQS process, all service requests over $25,000 must go through the Multiple Task Award Contract (MTAC) 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 awarded areas. Vendors will be required to provide a scope 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 (PO). This process is to ensure competition among the large number of vendors eligible to provide service as a result of this procurement. Future RAs for these services will be submitted in batches as new providers are presented for an award.

	Awarded Vendors	Estimated Annual Amount
1.	Alvin Ailey Dance Foundation, Inc. The Joan Weill Center for Dance 405 West 55th Street, 2nd Floor, New York New York 10019	**$500,000**
2.	Ballet Hispanico of New York 167 West 89 Street, New York New York 10024	**$150,000**
3.	Ballet Theatre Foundation, Inc. 890 Broadway, 3rd Floor, New York New York 10003	**$200,000**
4.	Batoto Yetu, Inc. 12 Sylvan Terrace New York, New York 10032	**$50,000**
5.	Children's Theatre Center of New Jersey, aka ArtsECHO 3809 Park Avenue, Union City, New Jersey 07087	**$50,000**
6.	Circle of Dance Repertory Co, Inc. 30 The Glen, Glen Head New York 11545	**$50,000**
7.	Lubovitch Dance Foundation, Inc. d/b/a Lar Lubovitch Dance Company 229 West 42nd Street, 8th Floor, New York New York 10036	**$50,000**
8.	Martha Graham School of Contemporary Dance, Inc. 316 East 63rd Street, New York New York 10065	**$50,000**
9.	Orchestra of St. Lukes 330 West 42nd Street, New York New York 10036	**$75,000**
10.	New York City Ballet 70 Lincoln Center, 8th Floor, New York 10023	**$75,000**
11.	New York Chinese Cultural Center, Inc. 390 Broadway, 2nd Floor, New York New York 10013	**$75,000**
12.	New Museum of Contemporary Art 235 Bowery, 5th Floor, New York New York 10002	**$50,000**
13.	Noble Maritime Collection 1000 Richmond Terrace, Building D, Staten Island New York 10301	**$50,000**
14.	Society of the Third Street Music School Settlement, Inc. 235 East 11th Street, New York New York 10003	**$250,000**
15.	Sundog Theatre, Inc. P.O Box 10183, Staten Island, New York 10301	**$250,000**
16.	Making Books Sing, Inc. 340 East 46th Street New York, New York 10017	**$250,000**
17.	The Midtown Management Group, Inc. 630 Ninth Avenue, Suite 802, New York, New York 10036	**$150,000**

The rationale for the 6 vendor's down-select decisions is provided in the chart below.

	Vendor's Name	Justification for Down-Select
1.	*Pearl Theatre	No evidence indicating how teachers can use the program to further enhance the teaching and learning of arts.
2.	The Caribbean American Steel Pan	Vendor failed to show evidence of prior success with providing quality arts education programs, including effective program design, management and evaluation.
3.	*Spanish Theatre Repertory (Repertorio Espanol)	Proposal lacks detail as to how their program will deliver the presence of sequence, scaffolding or pedagogical content.
4.	*Neighborhood Music & Arts Corporation	Proposal is not clear as to how the programs will be implemented and whether they can fulfill the Blueprint curriculum.
5.	American Composers Orchestra	Proposal lacks detail as to how their program will deliver the presence of sequence, scaffolding or pedagogical content.
6.	*Overcoming Obstacles Music	Proposal requires a great deal more specificity with regards to content, timeline and ability to deliver service.

1*

* Vendor may not submit a proposal for Arts Education Services for 6-months from the date of their non-award letter.

AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS FOR THE PROVISION OF SCIENCE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (PQS #1C475) ~RA#2

Estimated Contract (s) Cost	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procure-ment Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$644,000	Various including Tax levy & Reimburs-able funds	September 3, 2008 to September 2, 2013 (5-Years)	Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS)	No	Requirements
Vendor Name & Address					
	See Table Below for Awardees and Contract Data (Appendix A)				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	**Division of Contracts and Purchasing**
Linda Curtis-Bey, Director of Mathematics and Science	James E. Whitfield, Procurement Contract Manager
Office of Curriculum & Professional Development	Division of Contracts and Purchasing (DCP)
Tel: 212-374-0703	Tel: 718-935-5129

Statement of Purpose

The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into six (6) requirements contracts with the vendors listed in Appendix A, to provide direct services to students (hereafter referred to as "*Direct Student Services*"), related professional development and planning sessions, and/or direct services to parents (hereafter referred to as "*Parent Services*"). These programs will be provided at the discretion of each participating school. The estimated annual cost for said services is $644,000.

A previous RA (#1) for Science Professional Development and Education Services was approved by the Chancellor on September 13, 2007, recommending ten (10) vendors for contract award. This RA (#2) requests approval for an additional six (6) vendors for contract award.

Discussion

Proposals were read and evaluated by a committee of members drawn from the Office of Teaching and Learning.

As a part of the PQS process, all service requests over $25,000 must go through the Multiple Task Award Contract (MTAC) 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 awarded areas. Vendors will be required to provide a scope 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 (PO). This process is to ensure competition among the large number of vendors eligible to provide service as a result of this procurement.

Six (6) providers were recommended for contract award by the evaluation committee.

No significant adverse information was revealed through background checks, thus those listed vendors are deemed responsible.

Pricing for science professional development services varies depending on the rates associated with each program proposed. Nearly all vendors selected for award under this new procurement had previous contracts with the DOE. The newly proposed rates were found to be fair and reasonable based on comparison with rates charged by similar providers.

The estimated annual amount for each awarded vendor was based on prior year utilization. For vendors new to the system, estimated annual amount was based on discussions with the program owner, the internal client and consideration of the vendors' availability to perform the proposed service.

Future RAs for these services will be submitted in batches as new providers are presented for an award.

Appendix A

	Awarded Vendors	Estimated Annual Amount
1.	**A.U.S.S.I.E.** 15 South Bayles Avenue, Port Washington, New York 11050	**$200,000**
2.	**After School Activities Program (A.S.A.P.)** 441 5th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11215	**$25,000**
3.	**Salvadori Center** **c/o City College of New York City Board Of Education** Wingate 02 New York, New York 10031	**$195,000**
4.	**CEC/Stuyvesant Cove, Inc. (Solar One)** 24-20 FDR Drive Service Road East, New York, New York 10010	**$50,000**
5.	**New York Hall of Science** 47-01 111 Street, Queens, New York 11368	**$99,000**
6.	**Intrepid Sea, Air and Space Museum** One Intrepid Square, 12th Avenue and 46th Street, New York, New York 10036	**$75,000**

AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS FOR THE PROVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (PQS #1C511) ~RA#3

Estimated Contract (s) Cost	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procure-ment Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$1,125,000	Various including Tax levy & Reimburs-able funds	September 3, 2008 to September 2, 2013 (5-Years)	Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS)	No	Requirements
Vendor Name & Address	**See Table Below for Awardees and Contract Data (Appendix A)**				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts and Purchasing
Linda Wernikoff, Senior Instructional Manager	James E. Whitfield, Procurement Contract Manager
Office of Special Education Initiatives	Division of Contracts and Purchasing (DCP)
Tel: 212-374-2358	Tel: 718-935-5129

Statement of Purpose

The Chancellor's approval is sought to enter into Special Education requirements contracts with the four (4) vendors listed in Appendix A, to provide direct services to students, related professional development and planning sessions, and/or direct services to parents. These programs will be provided at the discretion of each participating school. The estimated annual cost for said services is $1,125,000.

Two previous RA's (#1 and #2) for Special Education Professional Development and Related Services were approved by the Chancellor in February 2007 and the second in June 2008, including twelve (12) vendors for contract awards. This RA (#3) requests approval for an additional four (4) vendors for contract awards.

Discussion

Proposals were read and evaluated by a committee of members drawn from the Office of Special Education Initiatives.

All service requests over $25,000 must go through the Multiple Task Award Contract (MTAC) process for procurement of services. In such cases, users will create a scope of services and conduct a mini-solicitation process among the awarded vendors in their awarded areas. Vendors will be required to provide a scope and pricing based on their contracted services, which will be evaluated and scored by the user. Upon com-

pletion of this mini-solicitation process, schools will be able to secure services via a Purchase Order (PO). This process is to ensure competition among the large number of vendors eligible to provide service as a result of this procurement.

DCP conducted background checks for Vendors whose estimated contract amounts did not exceed $1 million dollars by reviewing the Vendex information as well as the Vendor Watch List, and no significant adverse information was revealed. Thus, those Vendors are deemed responsible. Currently, DCP is conducting comprehensive background checks for the following Vendors whose estimated contract amounts exceed $1 million dollars: Kaplan, Inc., and Wilson Language Training, Inc. Any significant adverse findings will result in an amendment to this RA.

Pricing for special education professional development services varies depending on the rates associated with each program proposed. Nearly all vendors selected for award under this new procurement had previous contracts with the DOE. The newly proposed rates were found to be fair and reasonable based on comparison with rates charged by similar providers.

The estimated annual amount for each awarded vendor was based on prior year utilization. For vendors new to the system, estimated annual amount was based on discussions with the program owner, the internal client and consideration of the vendors' availability to perform the proposed service.

Future RAs for these services will be submitted in batches as new providers are presented for an award.

Appendix A

	Awarded Vendors	Estimated Annual Amount
1.	**Manhattan New Music Project** 303 West 42nd Street, Ste. 614, New York, NY 10036	**$25,000**
2.	**Successful Learning Group, Inc.** 7 Bills Place, Brooklyn, New York 11218	**$50,000**
3.	**Wilson Language Training** 47 Old Webster Road, Oxford, MA 01540	**$500,000**
4.	**Kaplan, Inc. (Kaplan K12 Learning Services)** 1 Liberty Plaza, 22nd Floor, New York, NY 10006	**$400,000**

Recommendation for Award
RFB B0659A – Manufacturer Direct Food Products IV

Vendor	Estimated Value	Funding Source	Term of Contract	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?
Hanover Foods	$3,858,571	Tax Levy	3 Years	RFB	No

Service Requestor and Contract Information:

Contract Manager:
Janice Zapinsky – 718-707-4342
Office of School Support Services (OSSS)

Procurement Officer:
Fior Castellon - 718-935-2108

CONTRACT DESCRIPTION:

This award is for the processing of beef ravioli and delivery to the food service distributors with an estimated value of $1,286,190 per year and $3,858,571 over the term of the contract. The contract will commence upon execution through July 31, 2012 with the option to further extend by the DOE for an additional period of 180 days at the same prices plus or minus the annual PPI adjustment. The contract may be terminated by Hanover Foods upon 180 days notice prior to July 31, 2010 or on July 31st each year thereafter.

BID EVALUATION:

RFB B0659 was advertised for seven (7) days in the City Record and on the DCP web site. Twenty seven (27) bids were received covering 37 items, of which this RA covers one of those items. Due to the complexity of the evaluation process for this bid and the need to have items available on school menus, awards have been made as vendors completed the evaluation process. Ten previous awards have been made and another will follow with the final award (chicken strips).

Hanover was the only bidder for beef ravioli, so DCP asked other potential bidders why they did not participate in the solicitation. We learned that the prohibition of high fructose corn syrup would have required other vendors to change their commercial lines to meet DOE specifications.

Canned beef ravioli is classified as nonperishable approved protein "emergency foods" under School Food Emergency Meal Service Policy. As such, schools must maintain on hand at all times sufficient inventory to serve every student participating in our Food program for three days in case of an emergency. Emergencies necessitating the use of these foods could be as simple as natural gas not being available for cooking, or evacuation of a building causing the students to be served at another site.

The price quoted under this RFB is approximately 41% higher than the PPI adjusted prices from our last bid. Since the previous contract expired on February 15, 2009, we have been purchasing the beef ravioli from Hanover through the distribution bid as an "add-on" item at the same price quoted in this RFB. In view of this increase in price, we intend to expedite a competitive solicitation, as soon School Food has found other manufacturers willing to meet the new specifications.

Policy and Vendor Performance (PVP) conducted comprehensive background checks on Hanover. No significant adverse information was uncovered. A cursory review of the vendor's financial statements did not

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD, THE COLLEGE BOARD TO ASSIST SCHOOLS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Contract Cost	Funding Source	Contract Term	Procurement Method	Is contract retroactive?	Contract Type
$1,500,000	Reimbursable, Tax Levy, City Council	10/1/09-9/30/12	Listing Application	No	Requirements
Vendor Name & Address	College Entrance Examination Board, The College Board 45 Columbus Avenue New York, NY 10023				

Requestor:
Jason Henry – 718-935-2058
Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact:
Susan Dick-McKeon – 718-935-2027

Statement of Purpose:
Approval is sought to enter into a contract with College Entrance Examination Board, The College Board that will help students, particularly in English Language Arts, meet and exceed State standards and prepare them for AP courses and college through a program called Springboard. The three year estimated award cost is $1,500,000.

Discussion:
Core Curriculum schools, existing school users and new schools are interested in purchasing materials from College Entrance Examination Board, The College Board. These Materials are published and copyrighted by Entrance Examination Board, The College Board and fall under the criteria of a Listing Application. These materials can only be purchased from the copyrighter and publisher and are not available through other channels of distribution. Aligned to State standards, the Springboard materials prepare students to succeed in AP courses and in college. It emphasizes higher-order critical thinking skills, problem-solving skills, deeper conceptual understanding, expanded vocabulary, media literacy and more. Entrance Examination Board, The College Board is the exclusive provider of Springboard materials and provides professional development workshops geared to the methodology of the Springboard program with the purchase of materials.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO CONTRACT WITH HUSS LLC. AS A SOLE SOURCE TO PURCHASE AND INSTALL DIESEL PARTICULATE FILTERS ON SCHOOL BUSES FOR EMISSIONS REDUCTION SOLUTION

Vendor	Contract Cost	Projected Start and End Date	Procurement Method/ Funding Source	Is Contract Retroactive
Huss, LLC. 820 E. Research Dr #4 Palm Springs, CA 92262	$2,496,320	Execution thru August 31, 2010	Sole Source/ GRANT	No

Contract Manager:
Paul Weydig
Office of Pupil Transportation
Office of School Support Services

Procurement Officer:
Linda Rodriguez
Division of Contracts and Purchasing

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Chancellor's approval is sought to contract with HUSS, LLC as a sole source for the purchase and installation of Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) on approximately 160 school buses. Installation will begin upon execution of contract through August 31, 2010.

DISCUSSION

As part of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Voluntary Diesel Retrofit and Clean School Bus USA program, the New York City Council has mandated the use of the best available EPA and/or California Air Resources Board (CARB) verified emission-reducing technology. This grant targets newer buses which require an active DPF emission control system. The Office of Pupil Transportation (OPT) has identified approximately 1,332 buses in this category. This project is funded through a $7.8 million Federal grant under the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program. This grant focuses on those buses that need to be retrofitted with Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF).

The City Council legislation requires filters on school buses with engines dating from 1995 to 2006. Buses purchased after 2006 do not need any retrofit since all models must be manufactured to meet the EPA standards. EPA/CARB certification assures that we are meeting the criteria for the cleanest exhaust (providing at least 85% reduction of particulate matter).

An RFP was issued in 2007 and 7 proposals were received but the Huss DPF was the only system that met the requirements specified in the RFP. Five of the seven proposers

offered passive systems but the department conducted heat load tests and determined that the OPT fleet does not generate sufficient exhaust heat for a passive DPF to function properly. A passive filter requires an exhaust temperature of 250° to 300° C for 40 to 50 percent of the operating cycle to be maintained in order for regeneration to occur. Under certain operating conditions, such as crawling through city streets or heavy traffic, the exhaust is too cool to burn the soot so it builds up and begins to clog the filter, creating backpressure. Since the NYC DOE School Bus routes change regularly and cannot guarantee the temperature levels needed for a passive filter, the active filter was deemed to be the most suitable technology.

Of the two active systems offered, only the HUSS system was EPA/CARB certified.

As the only level 3 plus diesel system providing an 85% reduction in emission verified by EPA and CARB, the HUSS FS-MK filter was selected and piloted on 5 buses (one in each borough). It can be used with all on and off-road diesel engines through the 2006 model year, except those equipped with either diesel oxidation catalysts or exhaust gas recirculation systems. The performance of the HUSS filter was satisfactory for buses at the high end of the emission range and meets the grant requirements.

To determine if the DOE received competitive pricing, a comparison was done with the price paid for the same size filter by the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation and by Waste Management of New York. Each purchased three units and paid between 22-35% more. Huss also quoted 160 units of a similar but slightly larger filter to a private coach bus company in New York State for approximately the same price as the DOE. The name of the company can not be disclosed due to a non-disclosure agreement. In view of the above, prices are deemed to be fair and reasonable.

The following is a cost breakdown of the product:

HUSS MK Filter -	**$13,661**
18% quantity discount	**$ 2,459**
Subtotal	**$11,202**
Installation	**$ 3,110**
Shipping and Maint	**$ 1,290**
Subtotal Services	**$ 4,400**

Total per unit $15,602 x 160 = $2,496,320.

Huss has provided a tentative schedule to install about 20 filters per month.

A background check was conducted on HUSS and no significant adverse information was found. OPT was satisfied with the services provided by Huss during the pilot program, so Huss is considered a responsible vendor.

The EPA recently CARB certified another active DPF filter, so it may be that the Department could competitively procure these devices in the future. However, we can not be certain that they offer a viable alternative to the HUSS device without testing them in our environment. Since we currently have only one sure source of supply, and since the capacity limitations of that source can only assure installation of 20 filters per month, it is necessary to start the program by January 2010 in order to utilize the full complement of grant funds available.

In the meantime, the Department will release a bid expeditiously and, if the competitor's filter comes in at a lower price than the HUS device, the Department will immediately initiate testing of same. Allowing about three months for the bid process and 4-5 months to test, award a contract and for production/implementation, the award proposed herein provides for the retrofit of 160 buses by HUS through August 2010. Retrofits after July 2010 will be performed pursuant to the aforementioned competitive procurement.

AUTHORIZATION TO EXTEND SYSTEM-WIDE REQUIREMENTS AGREEMENTS WITH VENDORS PROVIDING INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH WORKSHOPS, CURRICULUM ENRICHMENT, AND MENTORING PROGRAMS (#1C377)

Estimated Extension Amount	Funding Source	Contract Term	Extension Term	Procurement Method
$2,648,190	Tax Levy	March 1, 2006 to February 28, 2009	March 1, 2009 to February 28, 2010	Request For Proposal (RFP)

Contract Manager:
Troy Fischer, Director, Office of Instructional Technology
Tel. 212.374.5342

Division of Contracts and Purchasing Contact:
Andrea Black, Contract Manager
Tel. 718.935.4984

Statement of Purpose:
The Chancellor's approval is sought for a one year extension for 16 Instructional Technology contracts. These contracts were originally awarded pursuant to RFP 1c377 to provide professional development, curriculum enrichment and mentorship services, which are expiring on February 28, 2009. Instructional technology services are necessary to continue with the Chancellor initiative to integrate computer technology for NYC schools.

Discussion:
The subject contracts provide comprehensive instructional technology professional development services through workshops, curriculum enrichment and mentorship programs throughout the Department. Schools utilized these services over the course of the past 3-years at a cost of $6,928,567.

One year extensions are being requested to ensure continuity of services. Replacement contracts are not in place due to the volume of expiring RFPs and conversions to the new Pre-Qualified Solicitation (PQS) process. A PQS for instructional technology services that will solicit replacement contracts is forthcoming. Vendors will have the opportunity to submit proposals and, if successful, receive contracts under this PQS before the expiration of the contracts extended with this RA. Continued procurement for instructional technology professional development services is critical to continue with the use and integration of technology within NYC schools.

Anticipated spend for each vendor is based on the average yearly spend to date. Vendors indicating no spend during the contract term was given an average figure of $50,000. Vendors whose spend during the contract term did not exceed the average figure received the same allocation ($50,000). Pricing and Terms and Conditions for these contract extensions will remain the same as the original contracts.

	Vendor	Contract Number	Total Spend Against Contract	Anticipated Spend During Extension Period
1.	Classroom Connect, Inc.	9701703	$8,000	$50,000
2.	Classroom, Inc.	9701251	$29,750	$50,000
3.	Custom Computer Specialists, Inc. 70 Suffolk Court Hauppauge, New York 11788	9701216	$279,280	$93,093
4.	Mouse, Inc. The Puck Building, 295 Lafayette Street, Suite 501, New York, New York 10022	9701332	$919,750	$306,583
5.	November Learning 12 Hathaway Road Marblehead, MA, 01945	9701300	$242,481	$80,827
6.	Riverdeep Inc. LLC 100 Pine Street, Suite 1 900 San Francisco, CA 94111	9701507	$901,285	$300,428
7.	The Center for Educational Outreach and Innovation Teachers College 525 West 120th Street Box 132 New York, New York 10027	9701247	$131,677	$50,000
8.	Tech4Learning, Inc. 775 Lotus Avenue, Oradell, New Jersey 07649	9701236	$212,100	$70,700
9.	Teaching Matters, Inc. 475 Riverside Drive, Suite 1270 New York, New York 10115	9701307	$3,398,490	$1,130,000
10.	Thirteen/WNET 450 West 33rd Street New York, New York 10001	9975215	$0	$50,000
11.	Touro College 27-33 West 23rd Street New York, New York 10010	9701525	$0	$50,000
12.	UB Foundation Activities, Inc. 672 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14209	9701771	$20,400	$50,000
13.	Computers for Youth, Inc. 322 8th Avenue New York, New York 10001	9701775	$24,500	$50,000
14.	National Urban Technology 55 John Street, Suite 300 New York, New York 10038	9701353	$80,635	$50,000
15.	Vergant, Inc./The Producers' Project 293 Central Park West, #3E New York, New York 10024	9701125	$32,540	$50,000
16.	JDL Horizons, LLC 6475 City West Parkway Eden Prairie, MN 55344	9701215	$647,679	$216,559
	Totals		$6,928,567	$2,648,190

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION

To amend original RA for contract with KPMG, LLP to administer the NYC School Survey during the 2009 - 2010 and 2010 - 2011 school years.

Estimated Annual Renewal Amount	Funding Source	Renewal Term	Procurement Method	Is Contract Retroactive?	Contract Type
$1,514,589	Tax Levy	First renewal period: 12/1/09 – 11/30/10 Second renewal period: 12/1/10 – 11/30/11	RFP	No	Requirements
Vendor Name & Address	KPMG, LLP				
	345 Park Avenue				
	New York, NY 10154				

Service Requestor/Contract Manager	Division of Contracts & Purchasing Contact
Kerry O'Brien, Director, NYC Schools Survey	Paul Simms, Procurement Analyst
Division of Accountability and Achievement Resources (DAAR)	Division of Contracts & Purchasing (DCP)

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The original RA authorized contract #9701582 with KPMG, LLP to conduct learning environment surveys in NYC schools for a three year term, with two one-year options to renew. However, original documentation did not specify dollar amounts for the renewal periods. Approval is sought to amend the original RA to set forth authorized expenditures of $1,514,589 for each of the two renewal terms, starting December 1, 2009 and ending November 30, 2011.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the engagement is to continue building on the Chancellor's initiative to provide school leaders with tools and resources to empower them to be responsible and accountable for the academic results of their students. This is achieved in part through the annual NYC School Survey that solicits input from parents, students, and teachers on the learning environment at each school.

In 2009, nearly 850,000 parents, teachers, and students completed an NYC School Survey; one in every six surveys was completed online – more than six times as many as 2008 – helping to conserve paper and reduce the survey's impact on the environment. In 2010, all NYC teachers will take the survey online, and we are directing more parents and students to go green this year as well.

This engagement will enable the enhancement, production, distribution, and analysis of the NYC School Survey in 2010 and 2011. Services provided under the terms of this contract account for parent, teacher, and student surveys, in 9 languages, for both general education and special education communities, a total population of nearly 1.5 million people.

NYCDOE launched the survey program in 2006 with an estimated amount of approximately $1.1 million per year over the course of three years. Following authorization of the initial request, the DOE exercised contract options that provided for an additional $890K per year, over the course of the next three years, to deliver on project requirements that included teacher respondent anonymity, teacher paper surveys, school and family hotline support, additional survey shipment tracking methods, increased accessibility of a parent and school support hotline, more widespread educator and family engagement strategies, outreach advertising, and accommodation of increasing parent response rates.

Based on three years of survey experience, we plan to extend contract services in the renewal term to continue the successful delivery of the citywide survey. The renewal amount is estimated at approximately $1.5 million per year over the course of the next two years to provide for the continued delivery of the NYC School Survey.

KPMG has been an integral partner on the survey from its inception. Their staff has the expertise and experience that the DOE needs in order to ensure that the learning environment survey continues to be a success. DAAR is satisfied with KPMG's past services under this contract. In addition, DCP reviewed the budget for the renewal period and determined that the blended hourly rate is lower than the original contract which was competitively awarded.

A review of DOE records revealed no adverse findings for KPMG. The Mayor Office of Contract Services VENDEX showed cautions for this vendor regarding litigations that were settled.