

**2021 K-12 Energy Curriculum Training**  
**Recommendation for Proposal Selection**

**Date:** June 14, 2021

**To:** The Energy Efficiency and Resource Management Council (EERMC)

**From:** Consultant Services Review Committee – Joe Garlick, Karen Verrengia, and Timothy Roughan

**Subject:** EERMC-2021-03 – 2021 K-12 Energy Curriculum Training

---

The Review Committee, comprised of Joe Garlick, Karen Verrengia, and Timothy Roughan, members of the Energy Efficiency and Resource Management Council (EERMC), reviewed the two (2) proposals received by the Energy Efficiency and Resource Management Council (EERMC) on May 24, 2021 for the subject EERMC-2021-03 – 2021 K-12 Energy Curriculum Training. The valuation was based on the following criteria: 1. Overview and Work Plan (35 points), 2. Qualifications and Experience (25 Points), 3. Project Management and Organization (5 points), 5. ISBE proposal (6 points), 6. Cost proposal (25 points), and 7. Interview Presentation Quality (10 points).

No interviews were conducted as the Review Committee believed that the proposals provided sufficient information to inform scoring and selection. Therefore, all proposals received 0 points in the Interview Presentation Quality category.

The proposal from the National Energy Education Development Project (NEED) did not receive an average technical score greater than the required 60 out of 65 technical points. Therefore, the cost and ISBE proposals for NEED were not opened, and the NEED proposal was deemed not technically qualified.

***Based on the review of the proposals submitted, the Review Committee has concerns around the budgetary expectations for this work and believes it is in the best interest of the Council to reissue this Request for Proposals (RFP), as is its right pursuant to Section 3.1 of the RFP.***

***The Review Committee proposes that the EERMC direct the Office of Energy Resources to re-issue the RFP within the next three weeks with the following amendments:***

- 1. Adjust the minimum technical component score required to be technically qualified from 60 to 55 points, as has been the threshold for previous RFPs containing 65 technical points.***
- 2. Clarify the scope of work to indicate the core service expectations of the project that the Council would like the respondents to focus on.***

<b>Offeror</b>	<b>Total Points</b>
Green Building Research Institute (GBRI)	96.00
National Energy Education Development (NEED)	Not Technically Qualified

Thank you,

Joe Garlick, Karen Verrengia, and Timothy Roughan

Proposal Scores

<b>VENDOR</b>	<b>Total Points: Reviewer 1</b>	<b>Total Points: Reviewer 2</b>	<b>Total Points: Reviewer 3</b>	<b>TOT. AVE.</b>
<b>GBRI</b>	96.00	96.00	96.00	96.00
<b>NEED</b>	53.00	53.00	50.00	Not Technically Qualified

Notes/Comments:

1. *GBRI*:

- GBRI has suggested curriculum in 3 grade bands versus only 2 from NEED. Appears to have a wider portfolio of trainings.
- Skilled, credentialed & experienced staff with deep bench; very organized workplan.
- Extensive marketing and voiceover artist a plus; like the July free intro.

2. *NEED*:

- Showed a lot of sample agendas but aren't as thorough in terms of detail of schedule and progress.
- NEED appears to have much more experience in this sort of activity than GBRI.
- Did not find the workplan particularly good (20 pages of evaluations/charts seemed to miss the mark in responding to the RFP).

	Reviewer 1 Technical & Interview Scores				
<b>VENDOR</b>	<b>Overview &amp; Work Plan – 35 Points</b>	<b>Quals &amp; Experience - 25 points</b>	<b>Project Mngmt &amp; Organization – 5 Points</b>	<b>Total Technical Points - 65 Points</b>	<b>Interview Quality Points - 10 Points</b>
<b>GBRI</b>	35	25	5	65	0
<b>NEED</b>	30	20	3	53	0

	Reviewer 2 Technical & Interview Scores				
<b>VENDOR</b>	<b>Overview &amp; Work Plan – 35 Points</b>	<b>Quals &amp; Experience - 25 points</b>	<b>Project Mngmt &amp; Organization – 5 Points</b>	<b>Total Technical Points - 65 Points</b>	<b>Interview Quality Points - 10 Points</b>
<b>GBRI</b>	35	25	5	65	0
<b>NEED</b>	25	25	3	53	0

	Reviewer 3 Technical & Interview Scores				
<b>VENDOR</b>	<b>Overview &amp; Work Plan – 35 Points</b>	<b>Quals &amp; Experience - 25 points</b>	<b>Project Mngmt &amp; Organization – 5 Points</b>	<b>Total Technical Points - 65 Points</b>	<b>Interview Quality Points - 10 Points</b>
<b>GBRI</b>	35	25	5	65	0
<b>NEED</b>	25	22	3	50	0

<b>VENDOR</b>	Average Total Technical & Interview Points - 75 Points – <i>(60 minimum for qualification)</i>	ISBE Points –6 Points -	Cost Points –25 Points -	<b>Average Total – 106 Points -</b>
<b>GBRI</b>	65.00	6.00 <sup>1</sup>	25.00	<b>96.00</b>
<b>NEED</b>	52.00	<b>Not Technically Qualified</b>	<b>Not Technically Qualified</b>	<b>Not Technically Qualified</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> Full points awarded as only ISBE proposal opened, however ISBE participation rate for GBRI is 0%