

RFP #17036

East Metro Training Group (EMTG) Learning Management System (LMS)

Project Manager: Stacie Martyn

Procurement Services Coordinator: Kelli Hoel

Issue Date: April 12, 2017

Due Date: May 17, 2017 @ 5:00 PM

The following proposals were received:

#	Company Name	Address
1	elogic learning	406 Morrison Ave, Raleigh, NC 27608
2	TargetSolutions	10805 Rancho Bernardo Rd, San Diego, CA 92127
3	immixGroup	8444 Westpark Dr Ste 200, McLean, VA 22102
4	Blackboard inc	1111 19th Street NW, 9th Floor; Washington DC 20036
5	Instructure Inc	Via Public Purchase
6	D2L	Via Public Purchase
7	SABA	Via Public Purchase

Picked up by

Date

Time

Final LMS Vendor Demonstrations

Three vendors were selected to demonstrate their Learning Management System products. Demonstrations were delivered via WebEx as set up by the vendor. Each vendor was given a suggested script of what features to demonstrate so that evaluators received comparable information on the products. Each vendor was then given 90 minutes to fully demonstrate their product and answer any questions from evaluators.

The evaluators consisted of Training Officers, administrative support staff and Information Technologists. The evaluators sat through all three demos of the products and subsequently discussed the features, advantages and disadvantages of each product – or at least how we felt that they would fit what we are looking for. Each product had advantages in some areas, and disadvantages in others. Considerations included ease of use, customization, ease of implementation, cost, data handling, and many others.

Eventually the group was able to reach a clear consensus on preferences as to which product would best meet our needs for this project as it is proposed at this time. The preferences and supporting information has been presented to the EMTG Policy Board for their consideration.

The preferences were as follows:

1. eLogic Learning
2. D2L
3. SABA

Once the Policy Board authorizes it, I will work with the City of Bellevue to execute the necessary agreements to begin the process of developing the new LMS.

At that point I will request to terminate the selection committee and request that the EMTG create a LMS Implementation Team consisting of training officers, admin support staff, IT specialists, and end users.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Dahl, Chair
EMTG Technology Selection Committee

On Thursday May 25th, a workgroup of EMTG technologists and training specialists met to review and evaluate the Request For Proposals (RFP's) posted by the City of Bellevue to provide a Learning Management System for the East Metro Training Group (EMTG). (RFP#17036).

Present were:

- Kevin Bryson, Data Analyst – Eastside Fire and Rescue
- Tim Dahl, Assistant Chief – Shoreline Fire Department
- Anna Emerson, Administrative Assistant – Bellevue Fire Department
- Rachel Garlini, EMS Coordinator – Shoreline Fire Department
- Kate Hansen, Administrative Specialist – Northshore Fire Department
- Denise McAuley, Data Analyst – Bellevue Fire Department

Seven RFP's were reviewed and evaluated:

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1. elogic learning | 406 Morrison Ave, Raleigh, NC 27608 |
| 2. TargetSolutions | 10805 Rancho Bernardo Rd, San Diego, CA 92127 |
| 3. ImmixGroup | 8444 Westpark Dr Ste 200, McLean, VA 22102 |
| 4. Blackboard inc | 1111 19th Street NW, 9th Floor; Washington DC 20036 |
| 5. Instructure Inc | Via Public Purchase |
| 6. D2L | Via Public Purchase |
| 7. SABA | Via Public Purchase |

Vendor	Initial Costs	Annual Cost	4 Year Cost	"Cost within project Reach"	Effectively met comprehensive Needs	Total Score
Points Possible				Y/N	Y/N	90 Possible
elogic learning	\$ 39,950	\$ 19,950	\$ 99,800	Yes	Yes	65
TargetSolutions	\$ 65,645	\$ 64,145	\$ 258,080	NO	NO	45
Blackboard inc	\$ 19,750	\$ 18,500	\$ 77,400	Yes	NO	50
D2L	\$ 71,252	\$ 42,600	\$ 199,112	Yes	Yes	70
SABA	\$ 68,108	\$ 30,600	\$ 159,908	Yes	Yes	75
Instructure Inc	\$ 31,393	\$ 26,393	\$ 110,572	Yes	NO	35
immixGroup	\$ 19,750	\$ 18,500	\$ 77,400	Yes	NO	50

The RFP provided the following evaluation criteria:

- 60% of score based on product capabilities
- 20% of score based on price of ownership over 4 years
- 20% of score based on vendor references

The Workgroup evaluated the RFPs using the following methods to score the criteria:

Product capabilities:

- Did the product meet all of the desired product capability criteria?
- How well does the product appear to address the desired criteria based on the RFP?
- Does the product have a history or examples of customers or applications that appear to be analogous for the expected use or needs of EMTG?
- What is the perceived impact required to get the product set up and running for the desired use for EMTG?
- What is the perceived impact required to maintain the product by EMTG staff for the desired use by EMTG?
- What is the perceived level of direct support available through the vendor and or other local users with experience using the product for similar application?

Price of ownership:

- While no specific budget has been identified, is the cost of set-up and ongoing cost within the reach of the EMTG? Is the cost identified a practical reality for the scope and budget of the EMTG?
- How does the price compare to the other RFP's?

Vendor References:

- Are there any analogous references/uses such as the project being sought by EMTG?
- Specific reference checks were not made and would occur after demonstration prior to the awarding of a contract.

It is difficult to fully judge these type of products simply on the basis of a written RFP, and certainly demonstrations will be needed to fully evaluate the products to make an informed choice. The RFP's did offer an opportunity to identify the potential capabilities and references for the project. A consensus decision making model was used to achieve the following results:

Excluded Vendors:

The following vendor's RFPs were eliminated for the reasons stated:

TargetSolutions: While TargetSolutions offered a robust emergency service turn-key solution, there was a concern that this was really more of an off-the shelf option rather than the customized product anticipated to meet the specific needs of EMTG. The group unanimously felt that the anticipated \$258,000 four year cost was well outside of the anticipated budget (more than double what was expected) for this project and would not be considered for implementation. Scored 45 out of 90 points.

Instructure: Instructure was unanimously felt to have not provided enough information to demonstrate that they could currently meet all of the desired capabilities as described. Scored 35 out of 90 points.

Immix Group and Blackboard Inc.: were both offering the same product at the same price. The group determined that while the product was widely used in the education community and might have the capability to meet the project needs, the application had some gaps that might require additional modules or more specific modifications. There was also no specific evidence or reference provided of the type of application that EMTG was seeking. Scored 50 out of 90 points.

Shortlisted Vendors:

It is important to note that a *final* decision cannot be drawn from the evaluation at this point, but a shortlist has been developed to bring forward for vendors to demonstrate their product's capability and application. All group members felt a need to see the products demonstrated to make any kind of selection or recommendation.

eLogic Learning: While the RFP responded to the information requested, a full demonstration of the application being applied for the purpose sought is required to properly compare and evaluate. This system is currently being used in South King County for an application nearly identical to the solution desired for EMTG. It was felt that leveraging this experience might require the least front-end set up workload. eLogic Learning proposed the second lowest cost of all proposals and lowest of the shortlisted options. Score 65 out of 90 points

SABA: This vendor provided probably the most comprehensive and direct response to the RFP. Based upon the material reviewed, it was felt that SABA may have the most robust solution. SABA did not identify any analogous applications of its product in its RFP, and therefore might require more front-end set-up. Scored 75 out of 90 points.

D2L: This vendor offered a comprehensive RFP and was identified as very robust solution with some experience providing a product to fire and emergency service customers, though not clear how analogous to the desired EMTG end product. For this reason it is not clear the amount of front-end set-up workload. This is also the most expensive option of the shortlisted vendors. Scored 70 out of 90 points.

Conclusion:

The workgroup unanimously recommends that the shortlisted vendors to participate in the vendor demonstration on June 8th. Each vendor should be given an allotted amount of time and a performance script to demonstrate their product, and an allotted time for Q&A from the Workgroup, Training Officers and the Policy Board. The workgroup will develop the agenda for the vendor demonstration.

Upon completion of the demonstration the workgroup should be able to make a recommendation to the Policy Board for a final selection.

Immix Group and Blackboard Inc.: were both offering the same product at the same price. The group determined that while the product was widely used in the education community and might have the capability to meet the project needs, the application had some gaps that might require additional modules or more specific modifications. There was also no specific evidence or reference provided of the type of application that EMTG was seeking. Scored 50 out of 90 points.

Shortlisted Vendors:

It is important to note that a *final* decision cannot be drawn from the evaluation at this point, but a shortlist has been developed to bring forward for vendors to demonstrate their product's capability and application. All group members felt a need to see the products demonstrated to make any kind of selection or recommendation.

eLogic Learning: While the RFP responded to the information requested, a full demonstration of the application being applied for the purpose sought is required to properly compare and evaluate. This system is currently being used in South King County for an application nearly identical to the solution desired for EMTG. It was felt that leveraging this experience might require the least front-end set up workload. eLogic Learning proposed the second lowest cost of all proposals and lowest of the shortlisted options. Score 65 out of 90 points

SABA: This vendor provided probably the most comprehensive and direct response to the RFP. Based upon the material reviewed, it was felt that SABA may have the most robust solution. SABA did not identify any analogous applications of its product in its RFP, and therefore might require more front-end set-up. Scored 75 out of 90 points.

D2L: This vendor offered a comprehensive RFP and was identified as very robust solution with some experience providing a product to fire and emergency service customers, though not clear how analogous to the desired EMTG end product. For this reason it is not clear the amount of front-end set-up workload. This is also the most expensive option of the shortlisted vendors. Scored 70 out of 90 points.

Conclusion:

The workgroup unanimously recommends that the shortlisted vendors to participate in the vendor demonstration on June 8th. Each vendor should be given an allotted amount of time and a performance script to demonstrate their product, and an allotted time for Q&A from the Workgroup, Training Officers and the Policy Board. The workgroup will develop the agenda for the vendor demonstration.

Upon completion of the demonstration the workgroup should be able to make a recommendation to the Policy Board for a final selection.