

EVALUATION COMMITTEE FORM

Title: Student Success Management System

RFP Number: 5521

Evaluation Date: March 13, 2024

The names of the members of the evaluation committee shall not be publicly disclosed until their evaluation report as required under Section 3-203.16 is published (48 hours prior to the award). Where evaluation committee members are not public employees, those members' names, educational and professional qualifications, and practical experience, that were the basis for the appointment, shall be made available to the public.

EVALUATOR NAME(S) AND PROFESSIONAL TITLE(S)

Name	Position	Entity
Dr. LaDonna Eanochs	Executive Director of Strategic Initiatives and Assessment	Alcorn State University
Alfred Galtney	Chief Compliance Officer	Alcorn State University
Dr. Natasha Hutson	Dean, University College	Alcorn State University
Desmond Stewart	Chief Information Officer	Alcorn State University
Jabreel Walker	Director, Corporate Scholars Programs	Alcorn State University

AWARDED VENDOR REPORT

The submission of this report is in partial fulfillment of the transparency requirement as set forth by the Public Procurement Review Board in Section 3-204.04 of the Office of Personal Service Contract Review Rules and Regulations. On March 13, 2024, we evaluated qualifications for Alcorn State University, Student Success Management System. The following potential offerors submitted proposals for evaluation:

- Anthology
- ConexED
- EAB
- Frequency Foundry
- Target X LLC

The award recommendation decision was based on information provided in each proposal. The information following supports our decision for this recommendation. Our comments on the strengths and weaknesses were expounded upon in the individual rubrics. After thorough evaluation and great consideration, we recommend that EAB be awarded the contract for Alcorn State University, Student Success Management System, RFP Number 5521.

AWARDED VENDOR: EAB**Average Score: 92.8**

- All required items in the RFP are addressed.
- Vendor materials are neat, professional, and easy to follow. Screenshots of the platform, charts and graphics were appreciated.
- Detailed ability to perform the scope of work.
- Experience with successful implementation at similar institutions, specifically HBCUs.
- Compatible with other systems currently in use (Banner, Argos).
- Extensive technical support is available to the client and included in the cost.
- Cost is fixed, all-inclusive, and reasonable.

Vendor Name: Anthology**Average Score: 51.4**

- All required items in the RFP are addressed.
- Vendor materials are neat, professional, and easy to follow.
- Detailed ability to perform the scope of work.
- Experience with successful implementation at other institutions around the country.
- Extensive technical support is available to the client.

Concerns:

- Vendor software (SAAS, Power BI) is not compatible with systems currently used by the university (Argos, Banner).
- Vendor cost exceeds other vendor proposals for comparable services, seems very expensive.

Vendor Name: ConexED**Average Score: 0**

- Vendor did not follow RFP instructions and was disqualified by evaluators.

Vendor Name: Frequency Foundry**Average Score: 70.8**

- All required items in the RFP are addressed.
- Compatible with Banner and social media outlets.
- Vendor materials are professional in appearance but are not labeled on the cover to identify each item submitted (technical, cost, management).

Concerns:

- Vendor proposal does not detail functionality provided in a comprehensive, clear way. Technical capabilities and implementation are not fully detailed. Pictures or examples of how the interface works and what it looks like would be helpful.
- Many useful functions are “add-ons” that are not included in base pricing. Because of this, the cost is misleading and could become very expensive as services are needed.
- Technical support is based on levels of packaging purchased and doesn’t appear to be included.

Vendor Name: TargetX LLC

Average Score: 82.0

- All required items in the RFP are addressed.
- Vendor materials are neat, professional, and easy to follow. Screenshots of the platform, charts and graphics were appreciated.
- Detailed ability to perform the scope of work.
- Cost seems competitive but licensing cost is separate from base price.
- Experience with successful implementation at similar institutions.
- Extensive technical support is available to the client.

Concerns

- Separate cost per user can be tricky and become expensive. This is a major concern.