

REQUEST FOR NON-COMPETITIVE CONTRACT - FOR BOCS APPROVAL ON: January 15, 2025

This form must be completed by Department Heads or their designee when requesting contracts where a determination has been made that seeking competition would not be in the best interest of the taxpayers. Completed form must be attached to all resolutions and requisitions. Check off each box that applies and provide the **required** detailed reasons in the JUSTIFICATION section.

VENDOR INFORMATION

Vendor Legal Business Name: Junior Library Guild
Vendor Address: 7858 Industrial Parkway, Plain City, OH 43064
Vendor Main Point of Contact: Vicky Sweet
Title: Account Supervisor Phone: 914.316.0083 Email: vicky@mlassociatesny.com
Detailed Description of Service and Contract Term: Annual Renewal of monthly book deliveries to increase collections/student
offerings.
Total Cost and Method of Compensation: \$ 21,588. 40
EXCEPTIONS PER SECTIONS 6 (D) AND 6 (Q) OF THE CITY'S PROCUREMENT POLICY
Contracts with medical or health-related entities.
Contracts with lecturers, other educational professionals or experts, and institutions.
Procurements which involve the expenditure of federal or state assistance where and to the extent that federal or state law, rules, or regulations conflict with the provisions of the procurement policy.
Contracts with not for profit organizations for the support, enhancement, or preservation of cultural resources and the arts.
Other contracts deemed to be in the best interests of the District; however, any such request for this exemption shall be made by submission of a written recommendation, including sufficient justification by the department head certifying that such exemption is necessary and appropriate in order to further the best interests of the District.
SOLE SOURCE: Only one vendor is capable of providing the service.
SINGLE SOURCE: The service is available from more than one source, but for particular reasons it must be procured from a specific vendor.
Single Source: Upgrade to existing software available only from the software developer who sells on a direct basis.
☐ Single Source: Upgrade to existing software available only from the software developer's designated Value Added Reseller for this territory.
X Single Source: Continuation of an on-going service already procured from this vendor. Provide the reasons why it would not be prudent to procure these services from another vendor.
Single / Sole Source: Sole provider of a patented or licensed service.

REQUIRED JUSTIFICATION: Provide detailed reasons why it is in the best interest of the taxpayers to contract with this vendor without competition. List other vendors and quotes that were obtained during the process. This renewal continues monthly delivery of book selections, based on the JLG selections for collection growth within school campuses.

Single / Sole Source: The requesting Department can demonstrate that such services, due to unique or special

circumstances, cannot be procured through a competitive Request for Proposal process.

APPROVAL: I certify that to the best of my knowledge the information above is a complete and accurate justification for the competitive procurement of these services.

1/1	C. Day. VO.
Department / Department Head Name:	movices Ur. Centhia T. Talmer
Signature: Whalaum	Merrices Dr. Centhia K, Palmer Date: 12/20/24

An evaluation of partnerships throughout the District

valuator Name: Dr. Cynthia Y. Palmer Role: Director, Library Services			
	Gene	eral Information	
Grant Name		Contract Amount	
Partner/Partner	Junior Library Guild	Date of Service(s)	January 2025-January 2026
School Site(s)	K6 and K8 campuses		
YES (if NO (if N/A Explain. On-goi	hree quotes for vendor services f yes, please list vendors below no, please explain) ng service providing fiction does this vendor/partnership	n/nonfiction titles to incre	
	g our student populations and increasing		
main objective To pro To pro To hel	e primary goal of the partnership of the partnership.) by ide PD to a certain population ovide programmatic support to by ide tutoring or instructional sip to assess current practices. In nect the schools with other respond to develop curriculum and accoport mental and emotional here.	n of the schools. the schools. support. sources. ctivities for the district, schoo	
YES NO (if N/A	cified goal(s) and objectives re no, please explain)		
Explain: Yes, specif	ied goals and objective to provide resour	ces to students are reached.	
YES NO (if	no, please explain)		

6. Did this partner supply appropriate materials and supplies necessary to accomplish goals and
outcomes?
() YES
NO (if no, please explain)
○ N/A
Yes, appropriate materials are delivered to accomplish goals and outcomes.
7. Did this partner provide adequate feedback and support?
YES
()NO (if no, please explain)
ŎN/A
Voc. adequate feedback and support is provided
Explain: Yes, adequate feedback and support is provided.

8. Please complete the Vendor/Partner Assessment Criteria scale below and rank this partner on the following areas:

Vendor/Partner Assessment Criteria					
Criterion	(1) Ineffective	(2) Somewhat Ineffective	(3) Somewhat Effective	(4) Effective	(5) Highly Effective
Preparation:					X
Provides high-quality					
services to meet goals					
Competency:					X
Knowledge of craft					^
Flexibility:				X	
Willingness to change				^	
or compromise					
Consistency:					V
Schedule & routine					^
Organization: Structured, orderly, & efficient use of time management					X
Professionalism: Interactions are cordial & respectful					X
Overall Experience with partner					X

Please indicate specifically how the vendor/partner impacted student achievement, leadership
development or district operations. Note: Please provide documentation and evidence of impact of
vendor/partner services.

JLG provides selections of ficti	on and nonfiction	titles meeting the nee	eds of our diverse stu	udent population.	
					- 1949
10. Use the space below	to provide any	y additional feed	back you think w	ould be helpful	
Signature of Evaluator Date: 142/14					
	****	* FOR PEER REVI	EW ONLY ****		
	Vand	lor/Partner Peer	Poviow Critoria		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Criterion	Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
Impact: Based on					
artifacts/evidence/					
evaluation					
					/
evaluation Overall Experience	ionba	reia		Date: 12/2013	24