

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE: September 5, 2007

TO: **BOARD OF EDUCATION**

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: **PROPOSED NEW POLICY 3231 – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: PURCHASING SERVICES – VENDOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

ORIGINATOR: J. Robert Haines, Esq., Deputy Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Barbara Burnopp, Chief Financial Officer

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education approves new Policy 3231 – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: Purchasing Services – Vendor Performance Evaluation. This is the third reading of this policy.

* * * * *

- Attachment I – Policy Analysis 3231
- Attachment II – Policy 3231

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY
Policy Analysis for Proposed New Policy 3231:
Vendor Performance Evaluation

Statement of Issues Addressed by the Proposed Policy Revision

The Board has never had a policy to address evaluation of vendor/contractor performance. This proposed policy will establish a requirement for a vendor performance evaluation process.

Cost Analysis

There is no new fiscal impact on the system as a result of the proposed policy.

Legal Requirement

N/A

Similar Policies Adopted by Other School Systems

Several other large school systems and other governments were surveyed and many have similar policies regarding vendor appraisal. Those surveyed include Montgomery County Public Schools, Wichita Public Schools, Williamsburg Public Schools, Prince William County Public Schools, States of West Virginia, Nevada, and Texas, and the District of Columbia. All of their policies were available on-line.

Draft of Proposed Policy (see attached)

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff

Staff believes it is important to have a board policy directing the establishment of administrative procedures for evaluating vendor/contractor performance on a given contract.

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: PURCHASING

VENDOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

THE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF VENDORS CONDUCTING BUSINESS WITH THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHOULD INCLUDE A PROCESS TO EVALUATE VENDOR PERFORMANCE UNDER A CONTRACT FOR PURCHASE OF GOODS, PERFORMANCE OF SERVICES, CONSULTING, CONSTRUCTION, CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT, BUILDING RENOVATION, OR IMPROVEMENT OF FACILITIES. THE RESULTS OF VENDOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS MAY BE USED IN SUBSEQUENT EVALUATIONS OF A VENDOR'S ABILITY TO PERFORM ON FUTURE CONTRACTS.

VENDORS SHOULD RECEIVE FEEDBACK ON THEIR PERFORMANCE, WHETHER IT IS POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE. IN THE CASE OF NEGATIVE FEEDBACK, THE VENDOR SHALL BE INFORMED OF WHY THEIR PERFORMANCE IS UNSATISFACTORY AND WHAT CORRECTIVE ACTION IS REQUIRED.

THE SUPERINTENDENT SHALL ESTABLISH ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR VENDOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. THESE RULES AND PROCEDURES SHOULD INCLUDE, BUT SHALL NOT BE LIMITED TO, A PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL, COMMUNICATION OF FEEDBACK TO VENDORS, DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS, A PROCESS FOR SUSPENSION OR DEBARMENT OF UNSATISFACTORY VENDORS, AND A VENDOR APPEAL PROCESS.

ALL CAPS indicate new material.
Brackets [] indicate deleted material.

Policy
ADOPTED:

Board of Education of Baltimore County