

REQUEST FOR NON-COMPETITIVE CONTRACT - FOR BOCS APPROVAL ON: January 15, 2025

This form must be completed by Department Heads or their designee when requesting contracts where a determination has been made that seeking competition would not be in the best interest of the taxpayers. <u>Completed form must be attached to all resolutions and requisitions</u>. Check off each box that applies and provide the <u>required</u> detailed reasons in the JUSTIFICATION section.

VENDOR INFORMATION

Vendor Legal Business Name: Follett Content Vendor Address: 1340 Ridgeview Drive Vendor Main Point of Contact: Julie Kieffer
Title: Sales Consultant Phone: 708.884.6358 Email: jkieffer@follettcontent.com
Detailed Description of Service and Contract Term: On going service/Follett Content provides books for public and nonpublic YPS
Total Cost and Method of Compensation: \$ 62,629.16
EXCEPTIONS PER SECTIONS 6 (D) AND 6 (Q) OF THE CITY'S PROCUREMENT POLICY
Contracts with medical or health-related entities.
Contracts with lecturers, other educational professionals or experts, and institutions.
Procurements which involve the expenditure of federal or state assistance where and to the extent that federal or state law, rules, or regulations conflict with the provisions of the procurement policy.
Contracts with not for profit organizations for the support, enhancement, or preservation of cultural resources and the arts.
Other contracts deemed to be in the best interests of the District; however, any such request for this exemption shall be made by submission of a written recommendation, including sufficient justification by the department head certifying that such exemption is necessary and appropriate in order to further the best interests of the District.
SOLE SOURCE: Only one vendor is capable of providing the service. SINGLE SOURCE: The service is available from more than one source, but for particular reasons it must be procured from a specific vendor.
☐ Single Source: Upgrade to existing software available only from the software developer who sells on a direct basis.
Single Source: Upgrade to existing software available only from the software developer's designated Value Added Reseller for this territory.
X Single Source: Continuation of an on-going service already procured from this vendor. Provide the reasons why it would not be prudent to procure these services from another vendor.
☐ Single / Sole Source: Sole provider of a patented or licensed service.
☐ Single / Sole Source: The requesting Department can demonstrate that such services, due to unique or special circumstances, cannot be procured through a competitive Request for Proposal process.
REQUIRED JUSTIFICATION : Provide detailed reasons why it is in the best interest of the taxpayers to contract with this vendor without competition. List other vendors and quotes that were obtained during the process. This on-going service provides delivery of library book selections for collection growth within public and nonpublic school campuses.
APPROVAL: I certify that to the best of my knowledge the information above is a complete and accurate justification for the competitive procurement of these services.
Department / Department Head Name: Cibrary Services Dr. Cynthia Y. Palmer
Signature:

An evaluation of partnerships throughout the District

Evaluator Name: Dr. Cynthia Y. Palmer		Role: Direct	Role: Director, Library Services			
General Information						
Grant Name		Contract Amount				
Partner/Partner	Follett Content	Date of Service(s)	January 2025-June 2025			
School Site(s)	Public and Nonpublic school	libraries				
YES (if y NO (if n N/A Explain. On-goin 2. In what ways d	oes this vendor/partnershi		vision/strategic plan?			
main objective To prov To prov To help To conn	of the partnership.) ide PD to a certain populat ide programmatic support ide tutoring or instructiona to assess current practices ect the schools with other	to the schools. al support. s. resources. I activities for the district, schoo				
YES	fied goal(s) and objectives o, please explain)	reached?				
Explain: Yes, specified	d goals and objective to provide res	sources to students are reached.				
(YES	r deliver on the expected a o, please explain)	greement and outcomes?				
Explain: Yes, this part	ner delivers on expected agreemen	nts and outcomes.				

6.	Did this partner suppl	y appropriate	materials and su	pplies necessary	to accomplish g	goals and
	outcomes?					
	(YES					
	NO (if no, plea	se explain)				
	N/A					
Ex	plain: Yes, app	ropriate mat	erials are delive	ered to accompl	ish goals and	outcomes.
7.	Did this partner provide	de adequate f	eedback and sup	port?		
	(i) YES					
	NO (if no, plea	se explain)				
	N/A	se explain,				
г.,	Yes, adec	auate fe	edback ar	id support	t is provid	led.
EX	plain: 100, addc					
8.	Please complete the V	/endor/Partne	er Assessment Cri	teria scale below	v and rank this p	partner on the
	following areas:				•	
	0					
		Ven	dor/Partner Asse	essment Criteria		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(E)
	Criterion	(1)	Somewhat	Somewhat	(4)	(5)
		Ineffective	Ineffective	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective

Vendor/Partner Assessment Criteria					
Criterion	(1) Ineffective	(2) Somewhat Ineffective	(3) Somewhat Effective	(4) Effective	(5) Highly Effective
Preparation: Provides high-quality services to meet goals					X
Competency: Knowledge of craft					X
Flexibility: - Willingness to change or compromise				X	
Consistency: Schedule & routine					X
Organization: Structured, orderly, & efficient use of time management					X
Professionalism: Interactions are cordial & respectful					Х
Overall Experience with partner					х

9. Please indicate specifically how the vendor/partner impacted student achievement, leadership development or district operations. *Note: Please provide documentation and evidence of impact of vendor/partner services.*

10 11 11 1 1-1			l	and does be also fail		
10. Use the space below	to provide any	additional feed	back you think w	ould be neiptu		
		1				
	MA	1		1	1	
Signature of Evaluator Date: 1420/24						
	V					
	***	* FOR PEER REV	IEW ONLY *****			
	Vend	or/Partner Peer	· Roview Criteria			
Vendor/Partner Peer Review Criteria (2) (3) (5)						
Criterion	(1) Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Somewhat Effective	(4) Effective	Highly Effective	
Impact:					1	
Based on						
artifacts/evidence/ evaluation						
evaluation						
					V	
evaluation Overall Experience					V	
evaluation Overall Experience	olon bare	10-		Date: 12/20/	24	