

# **SIT ISMS TENDER PROPOSAL**

## **EVALUATION REPORT**

### **1. Project summary/description**

- 1.1. The Integrated Student Management System (ISMS) is designed to provide educational institutions with a comprehensive platform for managing all aspects of student administration and academic processes. The system aims to streamline operations, improve data accuracy, enhance communication, and support decision-making by centralizing and automating the management of student information, academic records, financial transactions, and communications.

### **2. Project Objectives**

- 2.1. To centralize student data management, including enrollment, academic records, and financials, into a single, user-friendly system.
- 2.2. To enhance the efficiency and accuracy of administrative processes by automating routine tasks such as course registration, grade entry, and fee processing.
- 2.3. To improve communication between students, faculty, and administration through a centralized communication hub.
- 2.4. To provide real-time reporting and analytics capabilities, enabling data-driven decision-making for administrators.
- 2.5. To ensure the system is scalable and secure, with the ability to integrate with existing institutional systems and adapt to future needs.

### **3. Approved Budget:**

- 3.1. 499,000

### **4. Tenderers Submitted:**

- 4.1. 6

### **5. Tenderers Shortlisted:**

- 5.1. Vendor A
- 5.2. Vendor B
- 5.3. Vendor C

## 6. Evaluation Summary

Vendor	Track Record	Cost	Technical	Summary
Vendor A	95	80	87	87.3
Vendor B	65	67	84	72
Vendor C	60	45	83	62.7

## 7. Recommendation:

7.1. Vendor: Vendor A

## 8. Reasons:

- 8.1. Vendor Track Record: Vendor A demonstrates a strong track record in delivering Integrated Student Management Systems (ISMS) to educational institutions. They provide detailed examples of successful implementations at **ITE, Riverside College, and Westbrook Institute of Technology**. These case studies showcase Vendor A's ability to handle diverse project requirements, from full-scale deployments to system upgrades and integrations. For instance, their work with Greenfield University has been operational for three years, "significantly improving administrative efficiency and student satisfaction" (Vendor A Proposal, Section 8). This proven experience in the education sector indicates that Vendor A understands the unique challenges and requirements of academic institutions, making them well-equipped to meet SIT's specific needs.
- 8.2. Cost: Vendor A offers the most cost-effective solution among the three proposals, with a total estimated cost of \$500,000. This pricing is significantly lower than Vendor B (\$800,000) and Vendor C (\$1,000,000), while still covering all essential aspects of the project including development, testing, deployment, training, and support. The proposal provides a clear breakdown of costs, allocating \$300,000 for development and testing, \$100,000 for deployment, \$50,000 for training, and \$50,000 for support and maintenance (Vendor A Proposal, Section 6). This transparent and competitive pricing structure suggests that Vendor A can deliver a comprehensive ISMS solution within a reasonable budget, potentially offering the best value for SIT's investment.
- 8.3. Technical Specifications: Vendor A's proposal outlines a comprehensive and well-structured approach to developing the ISMS. They detail a phased methodology that covers all crucial aspects of system development, from requirement gathering to post-deployment support. The proposal specifies key modules such as Student Enrollment, Academic Records, Financial Management, Communication Hub, and Reporting and Analytics (Vendor A Proposal, Section 2). Furthermore, Vendor A emphasizes the importance of scalability, security, and user-friendliness in their development process (Vendor A Proposal, Section 3). Their commitment to using "industry-standard technologies" and conducting thorough testing, including "unit, integration, and user acceptance testing" (Vendor A Proposal, Section 3), indicates a robust technical approach that aligns well with SIT's requirements for a reliable and efficient ISMS.

- 8.4. Additional Strengths:
- 8.5. Vendor A offers a balanced payment structure (30% upfront, 40% upon completion of development, 30% upon deployment), which aligns well with project milestones.
- 8.6. They provide a detailed breakdown of costs, enhancing transparency.
- 8.7. The proposal includes a 6-month warranty period, which, while shorter than some competitors, is still reasonable for addressing initial issues.

### Customer Comments

## 9. Summary

- 9.1. While Vendor B and Vendor C also presented strong proposals, Vendor A's combination of relevant experience, cost-effectiveness, reasonable timeline, and comprehensive technical approach makes them the recommended choice for SIT's Integrated Student Management System project.