



Evaluation Committee Report Substitute Staffing Services RFP#2019-102

1. List of Proposers:

- EDUStaff, LLC
- ESS Northeast, LLC
- Insight Workforce Solutions, LLC

2. List of Evaluators:

- David Oliveira
- Catherine Sousa

3. Proposal Comparison Summary:

EDUStaff, LLC (“EDUStaff”): EDUStaff is a substitute services organization based in Grand Rapids, MI. Its New Jersey office is at the Franklin Township BOE. EDUStaff services two NJ school districts and has 2 local recruiters, with the remaining staff located in Michigan. EDUStaff submitted a proposal that was responsive to the requirements in the substitute staffing services request for proposals. The Contractor’s Percentage for the period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021 is 29%, with the exception of hourly bus aides which had a Contractor Percentage of 36% (ongoing absence management software costs are the responsibility of the district).

ESS Northeast, LLC (“ESS”): ESS is a substitute services organization based in Cherry Hill, NJ. ESS services over 120 school districts in NJ and is the existing provider of substitute staffing services for the Piscataway Township Schools. ESS has management and recruiting staff based in NJ. ESS submitted a proposal that was responsive to the requirements in the educational staffing services request for proposals. The Contractor’s Percentage for the period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021 is 27.5% (absence management software costs included).

Insight Workforce Solutions, LLC (“Insight”): Insight is a substitute services organization based in Cherry Hill, NJ. Insight services 44 school districts in NJ. Insight has management and recruiting staff based in NJ. Insight submitted a proposal that was responsive to the requirements in the educational staffing services request for proposals. The Contractor’s Percentage for the period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021 is 27% (absence management software costs are the responsibility of the district).

4. Evaluation Criteria - The following were the criteria used by the committee in evaluating the proposal:

Criteria	Possible Points	Weighting Factor
<u>Financial Proposal</u> What is the cost of the program proposed and its impact on the district’s operating budget? How does the cost compare to other respondents?	1 to 5	25%
<u>Management Proposal</u> Considers the ability to provide services, operational efficiency, and	1 to 5	20%

management capabilities. Documentation of experience of the individuals that will assigned to the tasks of the district. Documentation of mentoring and oversight of substitute staffing services.		
<u>Company Details and References</u> Does the respondent document a record of reliable and competent service? Does the respondent have sufficient financial resources and has it demonstrated financial stability? Does the respondent sufficiently document relevant experience and references? Has the district had services terminated in the last five years?	1 to 5	20%
<u>Technical Elements</u> Considers the Contractor’s program overview, staffing resources, systems, procedures, processes, hiring practices, credentialing, compliance, human resources, training, technology, and evaluation criteria/process. Does the respondent’s proposal demonstrate a clear understanding of the scope of services and related objectives? Is the respondent’s proposal complete and responsive to the RFP requirements? Does the respondent demonstrate that they have an available pool of staff to meet all of the staffing needs of the District?	1 to 5	20%
<u>Start-Up/Transition</u> Is the Contractor’s start up plan customized to the start of this program? Is the plan detailed from pre-planning through the start of the contract through October 31, 2019? Does the plan document the transition from the present program to the new operations, or for the present contractor, the plan to start the new contract? Did the plan detail the additional management/resources they will be providing as well as the start-up task, any requirements for the district, implementation date, estimated completion date, and who is responsible?	1 to 5	15%

5. Scoring – The following is the scoring totals of the Evaluation Committee:

Award Criteria Scoring Summary							
Criteria	Weight %	Points	Weighted	Points	Weighted	Points	Weighted
		EDUStaff	EDUStaff	ESS	ESS	Insight	Insight
Criteria 1: Financial Proposal	25%	9.00	2.25	10.00	2.50	10.00	2.50
Criteria 2: Management Proposal	20%	6.00	1.20	10.00	2.00	8.50	1.70
Criteria 3: Company Details and References	20%	7.00	1.40	10.00	2.00	9.00	1.80
Criteria 4: Technical Elements	20%	7.50	1.50	9.00	1.80	8.00	1.60
Criteria 5: Start-up/ Transition	15%	6.50	0.98	10.00	1.50	8.00	1.20
Total	100%	36.00	7.33	49.00	9.80	43.50	8.80

Rankings:

ESS – 9.80 weighted points

Insight – 8.80 weighted points

EDUStaff – 7.33 weighted points

6. Recommendation of the Piscataway Township School District Substitute Staffing Services RFP Evaluation Committee:

Upon review of the proposal submitted, and based upon the RFP evaluation criteria, the committee concludes that the ESS Northeast, LLC proposal is the most advantageous for the Piscataway Township Board of Education and recommends that the Board award a two-year contract for substitute staffing services for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years to ESS Northeast, LLC with a markup percentage of 27.5%, subject to the terms and conditions in the request for proposals and contract on file in the office of the Business Administrator/Board Secretary.