

SOLE SOURCE JUSTIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Instructions: Briefly describe the items or service requested and list in detail the reason for requesting the Sole Source designation. Include substantiating data such as; companies contacted and the reason for elimination, technical data, etc. Since this is a request to depart from the mandated procedure for competition, request without support cannot be considered. The CNM Buyer may require additional information and remains the final authority in the determination of a Sole Source acquisition.

Date: May 26, 2021

Prepared by: MaryJo Villasenor

Vendor/Contractor

Name: Skyepack, Inc.

Address:

City, State, Zip:

Cost: \$74375.00

July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

Conduct Quality Matters Self-Review on a minimum of 120 Courses which have been recently (within the past six months) redesigned by Subject Matter Experts (Faculty) and Instructional Designers in preparation for Quality Matters Certification Reviews to be conducted beginning in Fall 21 and Spring 22.

Vendor must have Quality Matters membership and have the sufficient staff trained by Quality Matters facilitators to conduct a minimum of 120 QM Self-Reviews using the QM 6th Edition Higher Education rubric in the term of the project.

The vendor must also be prepared to provide the following additional required services:

The vendor must have experienced instructional designers, with a working knowledge of the Brightspace LMS, and the ability to collaborate with the subject matter experts to make course modifications to meet QM standards as prescribed in the QM 6th Edition Higher Education rubric within no more than 16 weeks from the start of the QM Certification Review Process.

1. Explain why this is the only available source that can meet the needs of your department.

We met with a total of eight vendors regarding their ability to provide quality assurance checks using the QM 6th Edition Higher Education rubric. We explained the purpose and scope of the quality assurance reviews as a significant factor in vendor selection for the project. Five of the vendors declined to bid on the project after the initial meeting because they did not have either the experience or qualified staffing to complete quality assurance reviews using the QM Sixth Editions Higher Education rubric. One vendor who did have extensive QM experience stated they would only review courses that they had built, and not courses that were built or remodeled by anyone else. The remaining three vendors submitted a SOW or written quote for the quality assurance or quality check & revisions needed to bring courses into certification review readiness and the results are listed below in item 3.

2. Explain why this vendor is the only available source from which to obtain this product or service.

The company has affirmed (memo from vendor is attached) that there is no other source for this item. Our search for possible vendors proved futile; OR

Other reason, please explain in full. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

In meeting with eight vendors regarding the colleges needs for the project, the Quality Assurance portion of the project led five of the eight vendors to decline further negotiations. Those that did respond offered SOW's that were significantly lower in both quantity and price per course for the described QA services.

Quotes from the three other vendors who either submitted a SOW or responded with written interest could not meet the pricing per course, nor provide the quantity of courses required for the price. Vendor proposed course quantities ranged from 50 to 48 to 13 courses in the project period from 5/17/21 to 1/7/22. Price per course from the other vendors ranged from \$4600 for a high down to \$1200 for low. The disparity in the quotes was more than double what Skyepack proposed, and nearly three times our in-house costs for the same services.

3. Explain why the price is considered fair and reasonable.

Skyepack SOW proposed up to 120 courses for the project for Quality Check & Revisions. The amount per course came in at \$550, which is much more in line with our inhouse costs for Quality Assurance of \$480 at 12.5 hours per course, than all other vendors. Vendor has worked with Quality Matters, and has the human resources to provide the QM Self-Reviews within the project timeframe. Vendor staff has the necessary training to complete the QM Self-Reviews.

Quotes from the three other vendors who either submitted a SOW or responded with written interest could not meet the pricing per course, nor provide the quantity of courses required for the price. Vendor proposed course quantities ranged from 50 to 48 to 13 courses in the project period from 5/17/21 to 1/7/22. Price per course from the other vendors ranged from \$4600 for a high down to \$1200 for low. The disparity in the quotes was more than double what Skyepack proposed, and nearly three times our in-house costs for the same services.

4. Describe the efforts made to obtain the best possible price from this sole source vendor for the taxpayers. What (if any) is the total cost savings from the original quote? (Attach additional sheets if necessary).

Skyepack SOW proposed up to 120 courses for the project for Quality Check & Revisions. The amount per course came in at \$550, which is much more in line with our inhouse costs for Quality Assurance of \$480 at 12.5 hours per course. Vendor has worked with Quality Matters, and has the human resources to provide the QM Self-Reviews within the project timeframe. Vendor staff has the necessary training to complete the QM Self-Reviews.

Quotes from the three other vendors who either submitted a SOW or responded with written interest could not meet the pricing per course, nor provide the quantity of courses required for the price. Vendor proposed course quantities ranged from 50 to 48 to 13 courses in the project period from 5/17/21 to 1/7/22. Price per course from the other vendors ranged from \$4600 for a high, down to \$1200 for low. The disparity in the quotes from the nearest vendor applicant was more than double what Skyepack proposed, and nearly three times our in-house costs for the same services.

APPROVALS:

Based on the above stated facts, the Purchasing Department has made the determination the justification for the Sole Source procurement is in accordance with §13-1-126 and will be posted for a 30-day period prior to award.

MaryJo Villasenor

Print Requester Name

AA - DIR

Title and date:

MaryJo Villasenor

Digitally signed by MaryJo Villasenor
Date: 2021.05.26 08:14:34 -06'00'

Requester Signature

Sydney Gunthorpe

Print Dean/Chairman/Director Name

VP-Academic Affairs

Title and date:

Sydney Gunthorpe

Digitally signed by Sydney Gunthorpe
DN: cn=Sydney Gunthorpe, o=Central New Mexico Community College, ou=Academic Affairs, email=sydney@cnm.edu, c=US
Date: 2021.05.26 14:49:18 -06'00'

Dean/Chairman/Director Signature

Pursuant to §13-1-126, the 30-day posting period of the Notice of Intent to Award this Sole Source request was met and no objections to award to the above referenced contractor were received. This Sole Source determination will be valid for the term indicated on page one (1) of this form.

May 26, 2021

Purchasing Buyer

Date

Purchasing Director

Date

Required Attachments:

- Letter from Contractor, if applicable.
- Campaign Contribution Form (Buyer)
- Other supporting documentation.