

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number: 260000000501**

**Notice of Intent to Award Date: 5/22/2026**

The Michigan Department of Education and Office of Partnership Districts has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal No. 260000001728 - Evaluation of Michigan’s Partnership Model and has recommended an award to Regents of the University of Michigan in the amount of \$829,345.14, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Jenny Manar, Solicitation Manager.  
 manarj@michigan.gov  
 517-241-2170

**Background Information:**

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide evaluation of Michigan’s Partnership Model. The term of this contract is three (30) years, with up to five (5) additional one-year renewal options.

**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on April 8, 2026, for 14 calendar days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of April 22, 2026.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences	1400 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 22202	No	No
Regents of the University of Michigan	1109 Geddes Ave, Ann Arbor, MI 48109	No	No
WestEd	730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA 94107	No	No

\*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business  
 \*\*GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

# EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

## I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

### Proposal Instructions: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

- a) Preference for this project are firms or universities that are research based and specialize in or have a unique understanding of evaluating partnership district models.
- b) The Contractor must have the capacity to connect survey results to a larger body of educational research and evaluation.
- c) The Contractor must have at least three years of experience in evaluation services that span case studies as well as policy and program analyses, developed through close partnership and informed by content experts for either state or federal agencies. It is preferable if experience includes educational background.
- d) The Contractor’s evaluations must incorporate rigorous and responsive research methods to generate valid, reliable evidence tailored to client goals by identifying key questions and selecting the most relevant and efficient qualitative and quantitative methods.
- e) The Contractor’s approach to evaluations must have the ability to incorporate flexibility, adapting to changing conditions using data analysis, surveys, interviews, observations, and other strategies to evaluate implementation, impact, and cost-effectiveness. Contractor must be able to provide proof of competency through examples.

### Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
	Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1	45
	Service Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 and 3	20
	Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4	15
	Project Management – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5 and 10	10
	Vendor Questions Worksheet	10
	Total	100

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

## II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	
Daniel LaDue - Supervisor MDE/Office of Partnership Districts	John Gilchrist – Financial Specialist MDE/Office of Financial Management
Jill Baynes – Department Manager MDE/Office of Partnership Districts	Jenny Manar – Buyer MDE/Office of Financial Management
Yvonne Dixon – Director MDE/Office of Partnership Districts	Carol Munroe – Departmental Analyst MDE/Office of Financial Management
Advisory	
Traci Teasley – Partnership Agreement Liaison MDE/Office of Partnership Districts	Liesel Carlson – Partnership Agreement Liaison MDE/Office of Partnership Districts

### III. Evaluation Results

#### A. American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences

The Evaluation Team determined that **American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences** based on a score of **95**, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1. 43/45  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Limited surveying of schools over life of the contract.
2. Service Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 and 3. 20/20  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirement.
3. Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4. 15/15  
 The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirement.
4. Project Management – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5 and 10. 8/10  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Referenced only 26 partnership districts when there are 55 districts on the partnership list.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet. 9/10  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Inconsistent/incomplete answer to question #2.

**Total Score: 95/100**

## **B. Regents of the University of Michigan**

The Evaluation Team determined that **Regents of the University of Michigan** based on a score of **91**, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

### **1. Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1. 41/45**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Reports attached were research specific.
- b. Overall plan lacked specificity.

### **2. Service Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 and 3. 20/20**

The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirements.

### **3. Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4. 12/15**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Not all staff were identified.
- b. No info on project management structure.

### **4. Project Management – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5 and 10. 10/10**

The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirements.

### **5. Vendor Questions Worksheet 8/10**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Did not fully answer experience section.

**Total Score: 91/100**

## **C. WestEd**

The Evaluation Team determined that **WestEd** based on a score of **92**, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

### **1. Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1. 42/45**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Mixed methods approach was not specific to this evaluation.
- b. Cohort group was from 2022.

### **2. Service Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 and 3. 19/20**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Concerns over budget constraints and data dashboard.

**3. Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4. 12/15**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Subcontractor heavily used.
- b. Numerous exceptions noted via strikethroughs.

**4. Project Management – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5 and 10. 9/10**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Lacking detail, more specifics needed.

**5. Vendor Questions Worksheet. 10/10**

The Evaluation Team determined that the bidder met requirements.

**Total Score: 92/100**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

Selection Criteria		American Institutes for Research	Regents of the University of Michigan	WestEd
1	Requirements - Section 1	43	41	42
2	Service Requirements – Sections 2 and 3	20	20	19
3	Staffing – Section 4	15	12	12
4	Project Management – Sections 5 and 10	8	10	9
5	Vendor Questions Worksheet	9	8	10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>92</b>

**V. Pricing Summary**

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

	<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Regents of the University of Michigan</b>	<b>WestEd</b>	<b>American Institutes for Research</b>
<b>Year 1</b>	Personnel	\$198,612.23	\$171,849.81	\$383,532.90
	Other Expenses	\$5,730.00	\$229,477.50	\$20,501.80
	Travel	\$12,000.00	\$23,382.45	\$14,820.68
<b>Year 2</b>	Personnel	\$287,124.32	\$171,965.24	\$318,069.80
	Other Expenses	\$1,505.00	\$82,477.50	\$20,501.80
	Travel	\$12,000.00	\$11,691.23	\$14,820.68
<b>Year 3</b>	Personnel	\$298,868.59	\$166,697.22	\$325,986.80
	Other Expenses	\$1,505.00	\$98,227.50	\$20,501.80
	Travel	\$12,000.00	\$23,382.45	\$13,415.05
	<b>Total Price</b>	<b>\$829,345.14</b>	<b>\$979,150.89</b>	<b>\$1,132,151.31</b>

**VI. Award Recommendation**

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

Regents of the University of Michigan provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include but are not limited to, the technical score, as well as the budget.

Award Recommendation is made to Regents of the University of Michigan in the amount of \$829,345.14.