Scale Label and Category Name	A	B	C	D	F	Penalties/Bonus
A.1. Financial Stability and Long-term Viability of the Vendor (Attachment B)	1. has been supporting LMS software for **more years than the vast majority** of vendors 2. has a **superior** installation base 3. has a **superior number** of employees 4. has a **superior** business strategy 5. is **indisputably** committed to LMS software 6. displays **superior** financial stability	1. has been supporting LMS software for **numerous** years 2. has a **solid** installation base 3. has a **solid base** of employees 4. has an **excellent** business strategy 5. is **strongly** committed to LMS software 6. displays **strong** financial stability	1. has been supporting LMS software for an **adequate** number of years 2. has an **adequate** installation base 3. has an **adequate** number of employees 4. has an **adequate** business strategy 5. is **adequately** committed to LMS software 6. has a **stable** financial situation	1. has a history of supporting LMS software that **may be inadequate** 2. has an installation base that **may be inadequate** 3. has a base of employees that **may be inadequate** 4. has a business strategy that **may be inadequate** 5. is **questionably** committed to LMS software 6. has an **uncertain** financial situation	1. has a history of supporting LMS software that is **clearly inadequate** 2. has an installation base that is **clearly inadequate** 3. has a base of employees that is **clearly inadequate** 4. has a business strategy that is **clearly inadequate** 5. is **questionably** committed to LMS software 6. has a **clearly unstable** financial situation	
A.2. Customer References – Vendor Response (Attachment H)	1. **suffice** in number 2. **precisely** represent the kind of organizations that we requested 3. are **relevant, clear, and complete** in giving info for requested info fields 4. provide reviews from outside publications that are **widely known and trusted**	1. **suffice** in number 2. represent **well** the kind of organizations that we requested 3. **are clear and complete** in giving info for requested info fields 4. provide reviews from **reputable** outside publications	1. **suffice** in number 2. **adequately** represent the kind of organizations that we requested 3. **are complete** in giving info for requested info fields 4. provide reviews from **valid** outside publications	1. **almost suffice** in number 2. represent **loosely** the kind of organizations that we requested 3. **respond in most of the fields** for the requested info fields 4. provide reviews from **questionable** outside publications	1. **clearly lack** in number 2. **do not** represent the kind of organizations that we requested 3. are **incomplete and/or provide irrelevant info** for the requested info fields 4. provide reviews from **unknown and/or irrelevant** outside publications	+1 letter grade: discloses a full customer list (Attachment H, Item 2)
A.3. Customer References – Customer Response (Survey)	category points multiplied by survey percent score A copy of the survey is not provided in this RFP.					

B.1. – B. 13. Software Product (Attachment D)	See "Requirements Evaluation" at the end of this appendix for methods of evaluating responses to Attachment D.					
B.14. Conference Room Pilot	Standards for evaluating the Conference Room Pilot are not provided in this RFP.					
C.1. Implementation Methodology (Attachment E)	The vendor 1. employs a methodology that **fits seamlessly** with BJU's circumstances 2. provides **solid** evidence that it can **exceed** requirements for implementation deadlines 3. provides biographical info that reveals **expert** staff that is **thoroughly tested via experience and certification**	The vendor 1. employs a methodology that is **well-suited** for BJU's circumstances 2. provides some evidence that it can **exceed** requirements for implementation deadlines 3. provides biographical info that reveals **experienced** and **competent** staff	The vendor 1. employs a methodology that is **adequate** for BJU's circumstances 2. provides evidence that it can **meet** requirements for implementation deadlines 3. provides biographical info that reveals **adequate** staff	The vendor 1. employs a methodology that **may be inadequate** for BJU's circumstances 2. provides **tenuous** evidence that it can **meet** requirements for implementation deadlines 3. provides biographical info that reveals staff of **questionable adequacy**	The vendor 1. employs a methodology that is **unclear or incompatible** with BJU's circumstances 2. ability to meet requirements for implementation deadlines is **doubtful** 3. provides biographical info that reveals **clearly inadequate** staff	-1 letter grade: fails to provide contact info for key personnel
C.2. – C.3. (Attachment D)	See "Requirements Evaluation" at the end of this appendix for methods of evaluating responses to Attachment D.					
C.4. Training (Attachment F)	The vendor 1. needs to provide only **minimal** training that is very **accommodating** for faculty schedules 2. makes available on-site training that **includes training during implementation** 3. **does not** assume overly technical skill levels from faculty 4. is **clearly** tailored to BJU's implementation specifications **rather than being generic** 5. Training is **unnecessary** for faculty and students since the web interface is intuitive.	The vendor 1. needs to provide only **minimal** training 2. provides as much **on-site training as requested** 3. **does not** assume overly technical skill levels from faculty 4. is tailored to **most** of BJU's implementation specifications 5. Training is **unnecessary** for faculty and students since the web interface is intuitive.	The vendor 1. provides training that is **manageable** for faculty schedules **2.** makes some on-site training **available** 3. **does not** assume overly technical skill levels from faculty 4. is tailored to **many** of BJU's implementation specifications 5. Training is **unnecessary** for faculty and students since the web interface is intuitive.	The vendor 1. provides training that **may or may not be manageable** for faculty schedules 2. provides training via **web-conference** rather than on site **or requires off-site training** 3. assumes **strong** technical skill levels from faculty 4. is tailored to **only some** of BJU's implementation specifications 5. Training **may be necessary** for faculty and students.	Training is 1. **inefficient and very demanding** on faculty schedules 2. is available only via **written** documentation **3.** employs **excessive technical jargon** 4. is tailored to **a few or none** of BJU's implementation specifications 5. Training is **necessary** for faculty and students since the the web interface **not** intuitive.	

D.1. Support (Attachment D)	See "Requirements Evaluation" at the end of this appendix for methods of evaluating responses to Attachment D.				
D.2. Support (Attachment G)	The vendor's support is 1. **immediately accessible** 2. reflected in **thorough** and **user-friendly** documentation 3. driven by **expert** support staff that is **thoroughly tested via experience and certification** 4. reflected in bug fixes of **superior** response time.	The vendor's support is 1. **easily accessible** 2. reflected in **thorough** and **user-friendly** documentation 3. driven by **experienced and competent** support staff 4. reflected in bug fixes of **excellent** response time	The vendor's support is 1. **accessible** 2. reflected in **sufficient** documentation 3. driven by **adequate** support staff 4. reflected in bug fixes of **adequate** response time.	The vendor's support is 1. **difficult to access** 2. reflected in **insufficient** documentation 3. driven by support staff of **questionable adequacy** 4. reflected in bug fixes of response time that **may be inadequate**.	The vendor's support is 1. **inaccessible** 2. reflected in **very poor** or **nonexistent** documentation 3. driven by **clearly inadequate** support staff 4. reflected in bug fixes of **inadequate** response time.	
E. Costs (Attachment C)	full points for tools at the five-year budget level half-point increase for every 1% below budget half-point decrease for every 1% above budget				minus half category points: failure to provide a 90-day proof-of-concept money-back guarantee