

Procurement report - Procurement of Learning Management System (LMS)

General information about the procurement

The procurement was performed according to the Act (2007-1091) on Public Procurement as open procurement procedure.

Basic data for advertising was sent to TendSign 2015-09-02 for publishing on the website www.tendsign.se, TED and was published on KTH internal website.

The time-limit for receipt of tenders was 2015-10-12 and the opening day was 2015-10-13. Until this day tenders from three companies have arrived:

- It's Learning AB
- Blackboard B.V.
- Instructure Global Ltd.

after this date, 2015-10-12, a tender from Ping Pong AB arrived to KTH, since this tender received after closing date for tenders it was not evaluated.

Assessment (qualification) of the Tenderer

The assessment (qualification) of the Tenderers has been processed with respect to the terms and conditions in the Tender documents for procurement. All three Tenderers have past the qualification under conditions stated in Qualification of Tenderer and means of proofs.

Assessment of the tenders

All three tenderers provided satisfactory replies and assessed to fulfil the mandatory requirements (must-requirements) in this procurement and were evaluated.

The tenders were evaluated in two stages, in Stage 1 "Fulfilment of evaluation requirements (should-requirements)" and in Stage 2 "Evaluation of Usability".

Stage 1 "Fulfilment of evaluation requirements"

The should-requirements were reported in Tendsign by the Tenderers with the following result:

Tenderer	Points for requirements
It's learning	376
Blackboard	459
Instructure	499

During the evaluation several questions were posted at Tendsign to Tenderers to clarify their replies. 4 replies which aspired for 10 points were lowered to 5 points since KTH did not agree with the tenderer that they fulfilled the aspired level in their reply.

These four were:

- Blackboard, 2.5.1 Evaluation requirements
 - The Tenderer should provide a customer case description of export and external archiving of course round data.....

KTH decided that Blackboard did not deliver a reply according to:
“Provided description of archiving of course data in e-archive at university: 10 points”

KTH decided that the reply was in line with:
“Provided description of archiving of course data in general repository: 5 points”

- It's learning, 2.4.6.2 Evaluation requirements
 - The system should be able to integrate with Schema.....
 - The system should be able to integrate with Profiles.....
 - The system should be able to integrate with Notifications.....

KTH decided (in all three cases) that It's learning did not deliver a reply according to:
“Simple integration: 10 points”

KTH decided that the replies were in line with:
“Can be integrated: 5 points”

KTH concluded to appoint the following points:

Tenderer	Points for requirements
It's learning	361
Blackboard	454
Instructure	499

In accordance with the Tender documents the three (3) Tenderers with the highest score in Stage 1 should be invited to Stage 2 “Evaluation of Usability”. Due to KTH have received only three tenders all Tenderers was invited to Stage 2 where offered systems was tested of an evaluation group at KTH.

Stage 2 Evaluation of Usability

KTH's evaluation of usability – purpose and methods

KTH's evaluation of usability delivered by a service is divided in three different areas using three different methods.

First, in the *usability test*, a representative number of users use the service (perform a number of different scenarios representative for the user's work situation) under as realistic conditions as possible. The purpose of the usability test is to evaluate if the service supports users to achieve specified goals with effectiveness and efficiency (ISO 9241-11).

Second, in connection to the usability test, the users will answer the questionnaire *System Usability Scale (SUS)*¹ individually. The purpose of the survey is to quantify the satisfaction of the service (ISO 9241-11).

Finally, an *expert evaluation* of the service is to be performed on the basis of the dialogue principles of ISO 9241-110. The purpose of expert evaluation is to see how well the service complies with the general guidelines for interface design, e.g. lack of coherence, unclear or confusing interaction and memory load.

Grading

Assessment of usability for the different areas

Area I: Usability test

- A. Usability effectiveness - maximum 260 points
- B. Usability efficiency - maximum 80 points

The fulfillment of effectiveness and efficiency are separately valued as follows:

- The service applies a solution that optimally supports the user's use of the service, i.e. that contains no lack of importance for usability – 100 % of the maximum points above
- The service applies a solution that in a good way endorses the user's use of the service, i.e. that has a useful function, but which in some respects can be improved – 60 % of the maximum points above
- The service applies a solution that supports the user's use of the service, but which in many respects can be improved – 20 % of the maximum points above

Note: if the user can't complete a scenario, the result is set to 0%

Area II: System Usability Scale (SUS)

Usability satisfaction - maximum 45 points

The fulfillment of satisfaction is valued² as follows:

- The service applies a solution with the best imaginable user experience, i.e. that contains no lack of importance for usability – 100 % of the maximum points above
- The service applies a solution with good user experience, i.e. which in some respects can be improved - 70 % of the maximum points above
- The service applies a solution with poor user experience, i.e. which in many respects can be improved – 40 % of the maximum points above

Area III: Expert evaluation

Fulfillment of dialog principles– maximum 140 points

The fulfillment of dialog principles is valued as follows:

¹ Brooke, John. SUS - A quick and dirty usability scale (1986)

² Bangor, Aaron, Kortum, Philip & Miller, James. Determining What Individual SUS Scores Mean: Adding an Adjective Rating Scale, Journal of Usability Studies, Vol. 4, Issue 3, May 2009, pp. 114-123

- The service applies a solution that optimally supports the user's use of the service, i.e. that contains no lack of importance for usability – 100 % of the maximum points above
- The service applies a solution that in a good way endorses the user's use of the service, i.e. that has a useful function, but which in some respects can be improved – 60 % of the maximum points above
- The service applies a solution that supports the user's use of the service, but which in many respects can be improved – 20 % of the maximum points above

Rating of Tenderers

The “Percentage in step” will be transformed into the “Tenderers Result” based on “Maximum points for rating stage 2”.

Rating for It's learning

Area	Percentage in area	Maximum points for rating stage 2	Tenderers Result
I A	55%	260	143
I B	43%	80	34
II	53%	45	24
III	26%	140	36
Total		525	237

Rating for Blackboard

Area	Percentage in area	Maximum points for rating stage 2	Tenderers Result
I A	53%	260	137
I B	38%	80	30
II	47%	45	21
III	20%	140	28
Total		525	215

Rating for Instructure

Area	Percentage in area	Maximum points for rating stage 2	Tenderers Result
I A	65%	260	169
I B	50%	80	40
II	83%	45	37
III	43%	140	60
Total		525	306

For details see “Appendix 1 Report of Usability test”

Summary, conclusion and suggestion for the decision

In accordance with evaluation model **the most economically advantageous** with respect to the terms and conditions in the Tender documents for procurement and using the method based on a model “Fixed price”, KTH will accept the tender that achieves the highest score in the both Stages, i.e. the highest total score.

The outcome of the evaluation gave these points:

Tenderer	Stage 1 (Requirements)	Stage 2 (Usability)	Total score
It's learning	361	237	598
Blackboard	454	215	669
Instructure	499	306	805

Tender from Instructure Global Ltd. has the highest score 805 point and is the winning tender.

Persons on KTH who have done this evaluation

The persons who have done this evaluation are:

Marina Busk
Procurement officer

Michael Welin-Berger
Project manager

Johan Fridell
Project manager

Åsa Lindström
Usability designer

Joakim Petersson
Head of development,
IT-department

Ann-Sofie Henriksson
Head of department,
ECE-school

Award decision

With reference to what has been stated above, KTH decides to sign the agreements with Instructure Global Ltd, Company Number 8938689.

Stockholm _____

Mats Herder
Dean of ECE-school

Period during which a contract can not be concluded

This report and award decision has been distributed to all Tenderers at _____.

This means that the contract can not be concluded before _____.