



OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

Recommendation for Contract Award

TO: Jenny Doherty
Director Procurement Shared Services

FROM: Linda Venneri
Collaborative Contracts Manager

DATE: November 30, 2020

RE: Evaluation of Proposals Submitted in Response to RFP #2020-COOP-LAV-45;
Online Proctoring Services

Part I – Summary

This RFP was issued pursuant to Executive Order 2015-2 dated January 20, 2015, and in accordance with Section 518 of the Commonwealth Procurement Code, 62 Pa. C.S. §518, and Part III, Chapter 8 of the Department of General Services (DGS) Procurement Handbook.

The intent of the RFP was to issue multiple award contracts for Online Proctoring Services. This is a new initiative by the State System in partnering with OMNIA Partners to make the resultant contracts (Master Contracts) from this solicitation available to other public agencies nationally, including state and local governmental entities, public and private primary, secondary, and higher education entities, non-profit entities, and agencies for the public benefit (Public Agencies), through OMNIA Partner's cooperative purchasing program. The State System acted as the lead contracting agency for any other Public Agency that elects to utilize the resulting Master Contracts. Use of the Master Contracts by any Public Agency is preceded by registration with Omnia Partners (a Participating Public Agency).

The RFP Selection Committee has completed its evaluation of the proposals, and as further described below and in the attached Scoring Summary, contract award is being recommended for four suppliers. This memorandum also documents that all necessary steps were taken in conducting the procurement in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Procurement Code. To the extent that written determinations are required under the Code for any of the following steps and no attached record exists, this memorandum shall serve as written confirmation that such steps occurred.

Part II – Process

- A. Procurement Method—A determination was made to use the competitive sealed proposal method as the State System desired to see various supplier proposals that offered the required services.



- B. Public Notice—Public notice of the RFP was posted on the State System’s website ([eProcurement Exchange](#)) on September 24, 2020.
- C. Evaluation Committee—An evaluation committee was established consisting of Office of the Chancellor and university IT, Academic Affairs, and Procurement personnel.
- D. Preproposal Conference—In accordance with Section I.5 of the RFP, a non-mandatory preproposal conference was held on October 9, 2020. The purpose of the conference was to clarify any points in the RFP which may not have been clearly understood.
- E. Addenda to the RFP—Potential Offerors were given the opportunity in accordance with Section I.5 of the RFP to submit questions concerning the procurement to the Issuing Office. The official responses to the questions were incorporated into the RFP by addenda.

Part III – Evaluation and Scores

- A. Evaluation Criteria—The relative importance of the major evaluation criteria established prior to opening the proposals consisted of 67 percent for technical and 33 percent for cost. A responsive technical proposal was required to achieve a minimum of 75 percent of the available technical points. Specific evaluation criteria included the following: Demonstrated Understanding of the State System’s Requirements, Supplier Qualifications and Experience, Work Plan, References, Value-Added Services, and Cost.
- B. Proposal Opening— Offerors were afforded five weeks to respond to the RFP. A total of seven proposals were received on or before the due date of October 26, 2020. Proposals were opened in a manner to avoid disclosure of their content to competing Offerors. The sealed technical proposals were distributed to the evaluation committee. The Issuing Office retained the cost proposals until the evaluation committee completed its technical evaluation.
- C. Results of the Evaluation
 - 1. The evaluation committee reported the results of its technical evaluation to the Issuing Office as indicated in the attached Scoring Summary.
 - 2. The Issuing Office opened the cost proposals and determined award based on final scoring of both technical and cost proposals.
 - 3. Overall Scoring—Based on the evaluation process, the overall scoring for this procurement can be found in the attached Scoring Summary.

Part IV – Recommendation

Recommendation—As the Issuing Officer, I recommend that contract award be made to Examity, Honorlock, Proctorio, and PSI Services for Online Proctoring Services. This recommended selection is based upon the results of the evaluation and review of the proposals as summarized herein. The term of the initial contract shall be three years. An option to renew for an additional two annual periods is available.

Part V – Determination

Contracting Officer Determination

- ✓ Based upon the results of the evaluation and the above recommendation, I have determined that the above referenced suppliers are the best qualified firm to provide the services based on the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

Linda A. Venneri
Issuing Office (Collaborative Contracts Manager)
Office of the Chancellor

Part VI – Authorization

Authorization—Based upon the Contracting Officer’s determination, I authorize the Issuing Office to make contract award to Examity, Honorlock, Proctorio, and PSI Services for Online Proctoring Services.

Jenny Doherty
Director Procurement Shared Services
Office of the Chancellor

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SUMMARY
LIVE PROCTORING

EVALUATOR	D2L	EXAMITY	HONORLOCK	PROCTOR360	PROCTORIO	PSI SERVICES	WISE EDUC.
1	0	472	492	312	486	496	0
2	0	456	447	371	459	459	0
3	0	428	433	359	440	440	0
4	0	478	466	388	480	460	0
5	0	465	462	390	469	470	0
TOTAL AVG SCORE (500)	0	460	460	364	467	465	0
% AVAILABLE POINTS	0.00%	91.93%	91.97%	72.77%	93.31%	93.01%	0.00%
MINIMUM POINTS?	Non-Responsive	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Non-Responsive
TECHNICAL RANK	---	4	3	5	1	2	---
TOTAL COST PER USER/EXAM (2 Hr Exam)	---	\$16.75	\$6.00	---	\$29.00	\$18.00	---
TOTAL COST PER USER/5 YRS	---	\$75.80	\$24.92	---	\$121.92	\$81.46	---
COST SCORE (250)	---	82	250	---	51	76	---
TOTAL RANK		2	1		4	3	
TOTAL SCORE (750)		542	710		518	542	
TOTAL RANK		2	1		4	3	

AUTOMATED PROCTORING

EVALUATOR	D2L	EXAMITY	HONORLOCK	PROCTOR360	PROCTORIO	PSI SERVICES	WISE EDUC.
1	0	472	492	312	486	496	0
2	0	456	447	371	459	459	0
3	0	428	433	359	440	440	0
4	0	478	466	388	480	460	0
5	0	465	462	390	469	470	0
TOTAL AVG SCORE (500)	0	460	460	364	467	465	0
% AVAILABLE POINTS	0.00%	91.93%	91.97%	72.77%	93.31%	93.01%	0.00%
MINIMUM POINTS?	Non-Responsive	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Non-Responsive
TECHNICAL RANK	---	4	3	5	1	2	---
TOTAL COST PER USER (2 Hr Exam)	---	\$4.50	\$4.50	---	\$9.00	\$9.00	---
TOTAL COST PER USER/5 YRS	---	\$20.50	\$18.69	---	\$37.84	\$40.73	---
COST SCORE (250)	---	228	250	---	123	115	---
COST RANK		2	1		3	4	
TOTAL SCORE (750)		688	710		590	580	
TOTAL RANK		2	1		3	4	

Notes:

- (1) D2L. Proposal deemed non-responsive. The Offeror did not agree to partner with Omnia Partners. Instead, the Offeror requested the State System partner with E&I where the Offeror holds a contract for its LMS. The Offeror declined to accept the RFP contract terms. Instead, the Offeror proposed amending its LMS contract with the State System. The Offeror proposed a product by Integrity Advocate which is a privacy company that actually provides the solution. The Offeror is a reseller. Multiple patents are pending. IA founded in iust 2015. The Offeror proposes integration of IA into our LMS, but no other platforms. The Offeror is in its first year as a reseller.
- (2) EXAMITY. Offeror provides 2:1 Live student to proctor ratio; is Global certified (reqrmt removed from RFP). In 2019, the Offeror received \$90M from capital investment company. Providing solution since 2013. Has higher education system experience. Offers standard and premium solutions. Hosted on cloud using Azure and AWS. Able to proctor in publisher platforms outside of LMS such as Cengage, Pearson, and McGraw-Hill. India support centers. Live Proctoring exams must be scheduled.
- (3) HONORLOCK. Offeror does not provide traditional live proctor based proctoring where a human proctor watches/controls the exam takers entire experience. Uses Live Pop-In. AI identifies suspicious behavior and triggers live human proctor to intervene in real-time. Committee deemed this hybrid model as acceptable. No scheduling required. Partners with Canvas, BB, and D2L. In business since 2015. Listed #236 in top 5,000 fastest growing companies.
- (4) PROCTOR360. Proposal did not meet the minimum technical required score. Company founded two years ago; no higher education system experience. The solution does not integrate with publisher platforms or any LMS. No specific details offered on encryption protocols, data breaches, system scalability, and data access. No third-party integration or active directory.
- (5) PROCTORIO. Founded 7 yrs ago; includes Browser Locking; Recording, Gradebook. Live Pop-In. Support based in Serbia. They are designated as a small business. No subcontractors. No scheduling requirements. Strong monitoring process. Strong higher education system experience. (Awarded the E&I contract.)
- (6) PSI SERVICES. Founded 20 yrs; first to patent lock-down browser technology. Operates in 120+ countries. 2,250 employees. Excellent higher education experience. Access PSI as an LTI - Learning Tools Interoperability without needing separate sign-on. Offers low-stakes proctoring for quizzes. Exclusive partnership w/Q5id - an identity managemnet company. Offers a job ready career-readiness platform which helps students with soft skills and workplace competencies.
- (7) WISE EDUCATION. Proposal deemed non-responsive. The Offeror does not provide live proctoring services. The Offeror did not agree to partner with Omnia Partners. Founded in 2018. Offers a student success mobile app which won't be available until 2021. Serves only eight institutions; no strong higher education presence. Use as LTI app on D2L. Limited description of company.